R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 003 941 48

THE TEACHING OF GERMAN IN THE UNITED STATES FROM COLONIAL TIMES TO THE PRESENT.

BY- ZEYDEL, EDWIN H.

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSN. OF AMERICA, NEW YORK, N.Y.
REPORT NUMBER NDEA-VI-1-20 PUB DATE NOV 61
CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8342
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$2.16 54P. REPRINT FROM REPORTS OF SURVEYS OF STUDIES IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES, NOV. 1961

DESCRIPTORS- *HISTORICAL REVIEWS, *GERMAN, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *UNITED STATES HISTORY, LANGUAGE TEACHERS, *MODERN LANGUAGES, SURVEYS, NEW YORK CITY, NEW YORK

AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE TEACHING OF THE GERMAN LANGUAGE IN THE UNITED STATES WAS REPORTED. A LARGE VARIETY OF MATERIALS WERE SURVEYED TO PROVIDE THE INFORMATION NEEDED FOR THIS SUMMARY, INCLUDING TEXTBOOKS, ARTICLES, PUBLICATIONS, AND RELATED MATERIALS. EMPHASIS WAS PLACED ON THE TEACHING OF GERMAN TO THE ENGLISH-SPEAKING SCHOOL AND COLLEGE POPULATION. DISCUSSIONS WERE PRESENTED ON (1) THE COLONIAL ERA, (2) THE REVOLUNTIONARY WAR TO 1825, (3) AN UPHILL STRUGGLE--1826 TO 1876, (4) ERA OF SELF-EXAMINATION--1876 TO 1899, (5) FIRST DECADES OF THE 20TH CENTURY--1900 TO 1916, AND (6) PERIOD OF RECUPERATION--1917 TO 1957. REPORTS IN THIS SERIES ARE ED 003 940 THROUGH ED 003 960. (RS)

1-20
SAE 8342

PRECEDING PAGE MISSING

THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

ED003941

Reprinted from
REPORTS OF SURVEYS AND STUDIES
IN THE TEACHING OF MODERN FOREIGN LANGUAGES
PUBLISHED BY THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION
NOVEMBER 1961

The research reported herein was performed persuant to a contract with the United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The Teaching of German in the United States from Colonial Times to the Present

By Edwin H. Zeydel

PREFACE

In partial fulfillment of a contract with the U.S. Office of Education under the National Defense Education Act, the Modern Language Association commissioned Professor Edwin H. Zeydel of the University of Cincinnati to write a summary of the teaching of German in the United States. A corresponding summary of the history of the teaching of Spanish in this country has been written by Professor Sturgis Leavitt of the University of North Carolina, and a history of the teaching of French will be written by Professor George Watts of Davidson College.

It is fitting that the German history should here be summed up by a teacher who, as editor of three journals in the field (*Monatshefte, The German Quarterly, The Modern Language Journal*) helped to make and chronicle so much of it. We are grateful to Professor Zeydel and hope that the present history will lighten the task of the historian who will document the teaching of German in the second half of this century.

Donald D. Walsh

INTRODUCTION

THIS attempt to write a fairly comprehensive historical account of the teaching of German in the United States from early Colonial days down to our own time must depend to a not inconsiderable degree upon the researches of numerous predecessors, at least so far as developments before the outbreak of the Second World War are concerned. Chief among these are the 150-page pioneer tract of Charles Hart Handschin, *The Teaching of the Modern Languages in the United States*, published by the United States Bureau of Education as Bulletin No. 3 in 1913 and representing a prodigious amount of original research, and E. W. Bagster-Collins' *History of Modern Language Teaching in the United States*, a 90-page treatise published as the first study in the volume *Studies in Modern Language Teaching, Reports Prepared for the Modern Foreign Language Study and the Canadian Committee on Modern Languages*[1] by fourteen authors. The work of Bagster-Collins leans somewhat upon Handschin, as does the present monograph, but he carries the investigation through the twenties of the present century, the principal event of the period after Handschin being the same Modern Foreign Language Study of which Bagster-Collins' tract forms a part.

Neither of these studies, of course, deals exclusively with German. This more limited subject is treated in some detail for the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries by Louis Viereck in *German Instruction in American Schools*, U.S. Bureau of Education, Report of the Commissioner of Education for the Year 1900-01, pp. 531-708 (with a bibliography, pp. 532-538); the same in German: *Zwei Jahrhunderte deutschen Unterrichts in den Vereinigten Staaten*.[2] Bagster-Collins does not seem to have made direct use of this work, perhaps because of Viereck's strong German bias. There is reference to the book in Handschin, pp. 31 and 116. Our general subject is also touched upon, in some cases with details, in the 70-page monograph of John A. Walz, *German Influence in American Education and Culture*.[3]

Additional information and help were culled from a variety of sources, such as the studies of Robert Francis Seybolt, among them his *Source Studies in American Colonial Education, The Private School*[4] and *Private Schools of Colonial Boston*,[5] also C. E. Castañeda's *Modern Language Instruction in American Colleges, 1770-1800*,[6] and the Annual Reports of the Boards of Education of various major cities, the Reports of the United States Commissioner of Education, the histories of various universities, and numerous other reports and fugitive articles, some very difficult to come by.[7] The typed Cincinnati Master's thesis of Sister M. Clarissa Riebenthaler, *Trends in the Teaching of German in the Secondary Schools of the United States*, 1941, is also valuable for its historical data, statistics, and bibliography, as is the recent University of Massachusetts booklet *Language Development in Action*, a report on current foreign-language developments, edited by S. C. Goding (1960). All these sources and many more have been used so far as opportunity and time have permitted, but the writer makes only the hopeful claim that his data will prove representative, nothing more. One of the principal problems in any such undertaking as this is one of selection based on judgment of comparative significance.

Another source of information was furnished by the German textbooks of the various eras, insofar as they were available. They were able to throw much light not only upon what was taught at their time, but also upon the prevailing methods of teaching, choice and presentation of material, and many other imponderables.

What has been said thus far applies particularly to the earlier periods of the teaching of German in this country, the Colonial era, the late eighteenth century (a particularly difficult period to treat because of the separate and disparate cultural centers of Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Jamestown, and the Carolinas), and the first half of the nineteenth. Our information becomes fuller after 1850, and ever more overwhelming as time goes on. The sources for these later periods will be indicated as they are used. My own experience with the learning and teaching of German goes back to the time I entered a public high school in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1907. It is marked from 1916 on by over forty years of teaching; from the twenties on by authorship of numerous articles and reviews, over a dozen textbooks, by many years as Assistant Managing Editor in charge of German book reviews, and five as Managing Editor of *The Modern Language Journal* (and incidentally as delegate to the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations), and seven years as Managing Editor of *The German Quarterly*. That experience has of course been drawn upon, too.

It is pleasant to record that the most recent period—since the Second World War with its ASTP-FALSC (Army Specialist Training Program, Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum)—may by and large be called the most fruitful and healthiest in the entire history of the teaching of German in the United States. It can be treated on the basis of the events themselves, still fresh in the memory of all who have played a part in them. To be sure, German has ceased to be the leading language in the curriculum of most public or private secondary schools and, for that matter, of most colleges or universities, as it had been until the First World War almost put an end to German instruction in this country. But once again it occupies a respectable place, especially in the colleges and universities, and it seems to be gaining in the

[1] Vol. XVII of the *Publications of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages*, New York, Macmillan, 1930. The general editor of the series and *spiritus rector* of the whole undertaking was Robert Herndon Fife.

[2] Braunschweig, 1903.

[3] Published by the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, Philadelphia, 1936. It is a revision of a paper read at a Round Table on American-German Relations held in connection with the Institute of Public Affairs at the Univ. of Virginia in July 1935.

[4] *Univ. of Illinois Bulletin*, No. 28, 1925.

[5] Cambridge, Mass., 1935.

[6] In the *Catholic Educational Review*, Jan. and Feb. 1925; also as a pamphlet, Washington, 1925, 22 pp.

[7] Like Viereck, Handschin gives extensive bibliographies.

secondary field because of the international political situation and thanks to the dynamic efforts of the Modern Language Association of America, under the leadership of William Riley Parker, Kenneth Mildenberger, Donald D. Walsh, and George Winchester Stone, Jr., and to the reports of Dr. James Bryant Conant, which are opening many eyes to the need for language study. In some important centers, too, it has penetrated to the elementary school field with the backing, or at least the sanction, of local Boards of Education.

If the work on this report has brought some lessons home to me more clearly than ever, their chief import is that in spite of the basically unstable position of the modern languages in the American curriculum, of which Bagster-Collins had already complained, their prestige now stands higher than ever; that if one language is damaged, as German was from 1917 to 1920, all the rest will suffer as well; and that a teacher of French, German, Italian, Modern Hebrew, Russian, Spanish, or whatever other language one may name, is first and foremost a modern language teacher with a strong collegial bond attaching him to all other modern foreign language teachers. If some of what is said, especially in the last section, duplicates matter to be found in the historical accounts of the teaching of French and Spanish, this is due to the fact that these closer ties now bind the languages together and that all of them have been equally affected by recent happenings.

In closing this Introduction, I should emphasize that like Handschin and Bagster-Collins, I will stress the field covered by the teaching of German to the English-speaking school and college population, although not neglecting entirely the exceptional schools that taught exclusively in the German tongue as late as the nineteenth century, to accommodate recently immigrated German and Austrian families that had not yet heard of Americanization or of "one hundred per cent Americans."

Section VI has enjoyed the immeasurable benefit of Professor Parker's suggestions. The whole history has profited from the criticisms of Emma Birkmaier, Bayard Quincy Morgan, and Donald D. Walsh. Others who supplied valuable information are mentioned in the appropriate places. To all these I express my deep gratitude.

EDWIN H. ZEYDEL

April 1961

I. THE COLONIAL ERA

The notion has long persisted that the earliest German impact upon the literature and culture of the American Colonies dates from the period just before the Revolutionary War, but that this influence did not become really significant until after the Colonies had secured their independence. The date often given is 1814, when George Ticknor developed an interest in German thought through the book of Mme de Staël on Germany and the work of Charles Villers on the German universities. Ticknor says (I, 11 ff.) in his *Life, Letters and Journals* (Boston, 1876), dictated from memory over fifty years later, that at that time he found it most difficult to procure books in New England from which to learn German. However, the researches of Harold S. Jantz during the past twenty years have exploded these claims most convincingly.[1] He has shown that the intellectual leaders in New England, even before the middle of the seventeenth century, among them Robert Child, Governor John Winthrop the Younger, his son Wait, and later his grandson John, and Increase, Cotton, and Samuel Mather, followed intellectual pursuits which reveal a striking interest in and acquaintance with German learning. Further evidence of this is furnished by preserved libraries and book lists of seventeenth-century New England scholars, such as Samuel Fuller, Governor William Bradford, Captain Miles Standish, and particularly William Brewster. They all owned English works on German subjects and German scholarly books, mostly written in Latin, to be sure. The official library of the Massachusetts Bay Colony possessed a number of German theological books, and in John Harvard's collection German works ranked second only to the English.

After the younger Winthrop came to America to live in 1631 he continued to receive book catalogs from Frankfurt and to correspond with over a dozen German scholars. Nor was he the only New England contemporary who knew German. Nathaniel Ward and Robert Child were both acquainted with the language. There were also in the Harvard College Library of those days many textbooks from Germany in the fields of chemistry, physics, theology, and almost every other branch of learning.

It follows that although the German influence in New England from 1620 to the end of the century was chiefly one of books and of correspondence, this served as a good climate for the learning of the language. As for emigrants from Germany, Jantz has found records of a few in New England at this time, particularly of four physicians. The most important of these was a Dr. Christian Lodowick (Ludwig) of Rhode Island, who later returned to Germany. Jantz compares him in importance with his contemporary Franz Daniel Pastorius of Germantown. No record of any German teachers, however, has emerged from the research into the role played by Germany in Colonial New England, although some private instruction in German was given, as later in the case of Ticknor, who was tutored by an Alsatian mathematician in Jamaica Plain.

Bearing in mind that culture in the seventeenth-century colonies was by no means homogeneous, we turn to other centers such as New York, Philadelphia, Jamestown, and Charleston, South Carolina. While French was doubtless the first foreign language to be taught—even before the middle of that century, especially in Charleston and New York, not to mention Louisiana—and while instruction in Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese followed soon after, German did not trail far behind.

The New Englanders, Winthrop, Ward, Child, and later William Bentley, undoubtedly acquired their knowledge of German either by themselves or in England, or possibly with the help of private tutors who were native Germans. The same is probably true of seventeenth-century scholars in New York, Philadelphia, and Charleston. But the earliest records we have of the actual teaching of German to groups point to Germantown and Philadelphia. There German is recorded as having been taught in 1702 to the children of immigrants who had come over, some with Pastorius in August 1683, the next group following in October, a year after the arrival of William Penn. Indeed, although proof is lacking, we are probably safe in assuming that such instruction had already begun in Germantown, at least informally, as early as the eighties, soon after the arrival of Pastorius and his little band. These were followed presently by additional immigrants from German-speaking Europe. The school of Pastorius was not directly supported by the church but by fees and special private contributions. It was coeducational and also held evening classes for adults.

At first the textbooks employed in Germantown were those brought along from Germany, but by 1702 the new all-German primer of Pastorius himself was in general use. Pastorius, a German lawyer, was an exceptionally skilled teacher. His early desultory activity as such was followed by two years of formal teaching (1698-1700) at the English Quaker School in Philadelphia before he assumed his duties as a teacher of German in Germantown in 1702. Nor was Pastorius, who had studied at the universities of Strassburg, Basel, and Jena, a teacher only, but a most versatile man and a polymath, like Benjamin Franklin and many

[1] See particularly his article "German Thought and Literature in New England, 1620-1820, A Preliminary Survey," in the *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (Jan. 1942), XLI, i, 1-45.

other distinguished men of his time. He served in Germantown as burgomaster and judge, and he wrote over forty books on a wide variety of subjects, including a comprehensive encyclopedia.

Born in 1651 near Würzburg, he had visited Frankfurt in 1682 after extensive travels, became acquainted there with the Pietist group of Spener, who had connections with the English Quakers, heard about the royal charter granting Penn a huge tract of land, and read the printed account of "the Province of Pennsylvania" (1681), which had already been translated into German. The Frankfurt Company was then founded. It purchased more land in Pennsylvania and appointed Pastorius its field agent. Pastorius became a close friend of Penn. He was an enthusiastic propagator of the best in German cultural life, but at the same time a firm believer in the importance of English as the "country language" of America, as he called it, although he knew very little English when he arrived and at first conversed in Latin with those who knew no German. He was also convinced that practical training in such fields as printing and engineering was of more importance for the time and place in which he lived than the abstract philosophy and metaphysics in which he had been trained. He died in Germantown in 1719.

Much but (as we shall see) not all of the early instruction in German offered in Pennsylvania, as well as in New York, Virginia, and the Carolinas, was given in conjunction with the various churches which were established as soon as the new immigrants had a chance to be settled on their land. They represented numerous sects—Lutherans, Dunkers, Moravians, Quakers, Reformed Lutherans—or they were dissenters, but all agreed in fostering religion and, closely bound up with it, education. The catechism and the religious tenets of their creed were taught assiduously, and pains were taken to make it possible for the younger generation to follow the German sermons of the preacher, who usually served also as the teacher. Little English was introduced in church or school. In fact these early preachers were scarcely familiar enough with the new language to teach it. It cannot be said that the quality of this instruction was good, for the general intellectual level of these clergymen was low. Discipline, however, was stern.

The value and the influence of these early schools have been debated. Viereck (p. 539) was favorably impressed:

> . . . the first parochial schools sometimes attained the level of passably good public schools, such as at that time were hardly to be found outside of New England, if anywhere. These schools were particularly important for the progress of culture in Pennsylvania, in which state the English Quakers did not possess the same deep appreciation for the necessity of public schools as did the Pilgrim Fathers, who established Harvard University at a time when the whole of Massachusetts contained not much over 5,000 inhabitants (1638).

One of his critics, however, P. H. Grummann, writing in the *Educational Review* (1903, XXVI, 194 ff.), considers him prejudiced. The German schoolman, Dr. A. Douai, years before had also judged these schools unfavorably, in a *Special Report of the Commissioner of Education on the Schools of the District of Columbia* (1868, p. 582):

> During the last two or three decades, it is true, a sufficient number of able German teachers came over from the mother country, so that the character of these denominational schools might have been extensively improved. But there being little intelligence among these congregations and their clergy, they could not understand the requirements of a good school, and that able teachers cannot be expected to thrive on so low salaries as from $200 to $400 a year, and to perform into the bargain the menial work of sextons and attendants to their ministers. Thus it is that hardly half a dozen of the several hundred schools of this kind have been worthy of the name of schools . . .

Handschin seems to agree with him (pp. 31-32).

Usually, then, it was not only German-language instruction as such, but rather general schooling, with German as the language of instruction, a practice which persisted at least in part throughout the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and into the twentieth, in certain communities with a sizeable first- or second-generation German population.

A German Mennonite school was founded in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, in 1706. The teacher, probably from 1714 for a period of ten years, Christopher Dock, is second only to Pastorius in importance for the early years of German instruction in America. He was born in Germany, but neither the date nor the place is known. After his ten years of teaching in Montgomery County he engaged in farming for a while, then in 1738 he took charge of two schools in Skippack and Salford, between which he divided his time as a teacher until his death in 1771.[2]

His "Schulordnung" (1750) bears the following descriptive and expansive title: "A simple and thoroughly prepared school order in which is clearly defined in what way children are not only best trained in the studies usually taught in schools, but how they may be well instructed in godliness; written out of love for humanity by Christopher Dock, an experienced teacher of long practice, and published by several friends of the common weal." This work of about sixty pages, printed by Christopher Sauer in Germantown, is the first book on educational theories and policy to be published in America. A second edition came out in 1770, shortly before Dock's death. Richard G. Boone, in *Education in the United States* (New York, 1890, p. 56) pays Dock the tribute of calling him the Pestalozzi of his day.

The first German Moravian boarding school for girls was opened in Germantown in 1742. Not long after, a Moravian girls' school was established in Bethlehem (1749), and German was taught there from the start. It still exists as the Moravian Seminary and College for Women. These and schools like them later took in pupils outside their denomination, and other schools were patterned after them.

There is other abundant evidence that the various Protestant sects, including the members of the Reformed Church, had established church-affiliated German schools in Pennsylvania at an early date. Many probably existed as early as 1720. Marion Dexter Learned, in *Americana Germanica* (II, 73), names the following teachers and locations of schools during the generation of 1720-40: John Philip Brehm of Whitpain, Montgomery County; George Michael Weiss, who had studied at Heidelberg; George Stiefel of Tulpehocken, Berks County; John Jacob Hock and Kaspar Leutbecker, also of Tulpehocken. Henry Mühlenberg and Michael Schlatter, who had studied at the Halle Paedagogium of Francke, the correspondent and friend of Cotton Mather, came later in the forties. They all worked for the further advancement of education among people of religious bodies with German connections.

But lay teaching of German to non-Germans also prevailed in Pennsylvania. As early as 1743 there existed a private school in Philadelphia in which English-speaking students were taught German, and in the same year Joseph Crellius and John Schuppy gave evening instruction with a similar objective. Another evening school of this kind was founded in Philadelphia in 1756 by Jacob Ehrenzeller, whose reputation was very good.[3] He was still teaching in 1770. Another popular lay teacher of German in Philadelphia around 1750 was John Mathias Kramer, who also taught Italian. Later he opened a school for the instruction of French, Italian, and German for gentlemen and

[2] See *The Life and Works of Christopher Dock, America's Pioneer Writer on Education, with a Translation of his Works into the English Language*. By Martin G. Brumbaugh. With an Introduction by the Hon. Samuel W. Pennypacker. Philadelphia and London, 1908.

[3] Seybolt in *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (1924), XXIII, 418-421. Abbreviated below as Seybolt, *JEGP*. Also noted by Bagster-Collins, p. 9.

ladies. Other German teachers in Philadelphia between 1750 and 1780 were Adalbert Ebert, Philip Keyl, Charles Cist, and Jacob Lawn.

As for lay teaching in other colonies, it is interesting to note that for a layman to teach in Dutch New York City, which probably had a population of less than 20,000 at the beginning of the eighteenth century, with some Germans among them, one had to be licensed. And so, on September 13, 1703, Andrew Foucautt (Foucault?) was officially authorized to "teach an English and French school within the City of New York," and on August 29, 1705, the same privilege was accorded Prudent de la Fayole.[4] No license of this kind seems to have been required in Pennsylvania, at least we have found no reference to it. But these "schools" in New York, whether they offered French or German, were probably not much more than private classes held in the dwelling of the teacher or of a student's family, or in rooms leased for the purpose. Sometimes the classes met in the evenings and consisted of adults. That there was a lively and steady demand for foreign language teachers is proved by the fact that the newspapers and gazettes from Boston down to Charleston often ran advertisements seeking such teachers. The motivation for studying a foreign language was in some cases purely cultural, and in other cases quite practical.

The economic situation of the lay teachers thus employed was as a rule precarious. It was noted above that, even later, $200 to $400 a year was no unusual salary. The teachers often followed some vocation on the side. One is reported keeping a general store, another selling orange oil and lemon and orange peel!

A concomitant of instruction in German was the publication of German books, the oldest being a 96-page duodecimo volume of *Divine Hymns of Love and Praise . . .* printed in Philadelphia by Benjamin Franklin in 1730 and commissioned by the monastery of Ephrata. The first Bible to be printed in America was also in German, and the work of Franklin. Until 1738 Franklin enjoyed a monopoly in this field and published numerous German hymnals, breviaries, textbooks, and catechisms; but in that year Christopher Sauer, mentioned above, opened a printing shop in Germantown, which offered competition. Sauer got out the first newspaper in America, *Hochdeutscher pennsylvanischer Geschichtsschreiber*, later called *Germantowner Zeitung*. It has been claimed, but not proved, that Franklin had planned (and even issued) a German newspaper, the *Philadelphia-Zeitung*, as early as 1732.

Of greater importance for our purposes are the following two works, for sale by Franklin in 1746: Benedictus Beiler, *A New German Grammar, to which are added some Useful and Familiar Dialogues*, which had first appeared in London in 1731, and Christian Ludwig's *Dictionary of High Dutch and English*, which came out with the German title *Teutsch-Englisches Lexicon* about 1745 in Leipzig. Very popular too was Bachmair's *A Complete German Grammar*, which seems to have been issued originally in England about 1750,[5] with American editions following in 1765, 1772 (also 1774?) and 1788.[6] Seybolt in the *JEGP* article describes it as containing in the first part clear, simple helps in speaking and writing German, while the second part offers familiar words, phrases, expressions, proverbs, and dialogues, pieces of prose (news items, letters), poetry, and adequate vocabulary. Besides there is an index of German words similar in sound to English words but of different spelling and meaning, names of occupations, materials, and tools, as well as "explication of a German proverb."[7] One is particularly impressed by the practical nature of this work, a first step toward functionalism. Textbooks will receive more attention below.

The estimate of Charles Lee Smith, author of *A History of Education in North Carolina*, issued by the Bureau of Education in Washington as a Circular of Information (1888), that during the first half of the eighteenth century only 30,000 Germans immigrated to the Colonies, and that three-fifths settled in North Carolina, is almost surely incorrect. Assuming that five thousand had come over before 1700, that would aggregate only 35,000 by 1750. If, as Smith claims, 18,000 of these settled in North Carolina, that would have left only 17,000 Germans in all the rest of the Colonies. However, between 1709 and 1740 thousands of Germans emigrated to the Colonies every year, in 1749 alone over 7,000 (Viereck, p. 542). They settled in Maine (at Broad Bay), New York (not only in Manhattan, but also in Newburgh), Philadelphia-Germantown, and all the way down the coast as far as the Carolinas. A trustworthy authority in such statistical matters, surprisingly enough, was the noted German scholar, Christoph Daniel Ebeling, who enjoyed close literary and personal contacts with America, among his correspondents being Thomas Jefferson and Noah Webster. He assures us that in Pennsylvania alone there were one hundred thousand Germans by 1755.[8] My guess, then, would be that by 1750 there were one hundred fifty thousand Germans, all told, in the Colonies. Another authority, Governor Thomas of Pennsylvania, writing to the Bishop of Exeter in 1748, ventured an even higher estimate: "The Germans of that province are, I believe, three-fifths of the whole people, and by their industry and frugality have been the principal instruments of raising it to its present flourishing condition."[9] German churches and schools may be posited wherever Germans lived.

Thomas, it seems, was in favor of immigration, particularly from Germany, and successfully opposed the efforts of the nativists to arrest it. His predecessor, Patrick Gordon, had sponsored legislation in the Colonial Assembly that would assess an entrance duty of 40 shillings on each immigrant, but this was repealed in 1730 because of the protest of Franklin and other leaders.

It was through Franklin's influence, too, that the literary and philosophical "Junto Club" was founded in Philadelphia about 1727, and in 1743 the American Philosophical Society. Through the efforts of Franklin and this Society a school called the Public Academy and College (1749) and another, the Charity School of the City of Philadelphia, were established. In the constitution of the former, Franklin, who believed in the practical advantages of learning foreign languages, introduced a provision that "the trustees shall with all convenient speed endeavor to engage Persons capable of teaching the French, Spanish and German languages." Franklin recommended the modern languages particularly for "merchants," but did not wish to exclude any interested student. In December of 1753 a Mr. Creamer (Krämer), a "gentleman from Germany," was found who was "very capable of teaching the French and German languages." He actually taught both for a while from 1754 on, at a salary of 100 pounds a year. In 1755 the Academy became a degree-granting college, and in July of that year relations with him were severed.[10] He is described as also "qualified" to teach

[4] Robert F. Seybolt, *Source Studies in American Colonial Education, The Private School*, Univ. of Illinois Bulletin, No. 28, p. 10. Also quoted by Bagster-Collins, p. 8.

[5] The second edition, dated London 1752, is listed in the new *General Catalogue of Printed Books* of the British Museum, VIII (1934), col. 720. See also C. R. Hildeburn, *A Century of Printing: The Issues of the Press of Pennsylvania, 1685-1784*, Philadelphia, 1886, II, 33.

[6] The edition of 1788 bears the title "A German Grammar containing the theory of the language through all the parts of speech." It contains only the first part of the earlier editions (100 pp. as compared with over 300).

[7] Seybolt, *JEGP*, pp. 420-421. See also Bagster-Collins, p. 10.

[8] *History and Geography of North America*, IV, p. 203.

[9] Viereck, p. 542. This would give Pennsylvania 120,000 Germans in 1748.

[10] See Thomas H. Montgomery, *A History of the University of Pennsylvania, 1749-1770*, Philadelphia, 1900, pp. 175 ff.; also *Pennsylvania University Biographical Catalogue*, 1747-1893, Philadelphia, 1894.

Italian, music, and painting. The Academy and College was the first *American* school in which German was taught, and the University of Pennsylvania is an outgrowth of it. But the modern languages were recommended only "to be studied at leisure hours" (Montgomery, p. 238).

In yet another way Franklin influenced the development of American education. On his journey to Europe in 1766 he paid a visit to the University of Göttingen and was invited to a session of the Academy of Sciences there. B. A. Hinsdale writes as follows about this visit: "It is rather surprising to find that the man who is the best embodiment of the practical spirit of American philosophy should have been the first American to show an interest in the higher education of the land of abstract thought and sciences. It is surprising also to find that nearly all the facts which we possess relating to the visit are found in German authorities.[11]

It was therefore not the group of young Americans represented by Ticknor, Everett, and Bancroft in the early nineteenth century who "discovered" Göttingen, but Benjamin Franklin sixty years before. Viereck ventures the conjecture (p. 543) that the College was turned into the University of Pennsylvania in 1779 as a result of the impressions which Franklin brought home.

For a while the Academy and College maintained a so-called German Institute. In 1780 a professor of "philosophy" was engaged whose duty it was to teach "Latin and Greek by means of the German language." This clearly indicates that the knowledge of German and the influence of Germans must have been rather strong in the environs of Philadelphia. A prominent Philadelphia clergyman, John Christopher Kunze, who enjoyed an excellent reputation as a teacher, was the German instructor. Besides, Kunze planned also a seminary for teachers. In 1773 he had engaged a young emigrant, a student of law from the University of Halle by the name of Leps, as an assistant. This seems to have been the first school of academic rank for the benefit of Germans in America and was modelled on the Paedagogium of Francke in Halle. But it was short-lived. The Revolutionary War put an end to it, as it did to other similar ventures.

With only brief interruptions the University of Pennsylvania has maintained a fine tradition in the teaching of German. After Creamer and Kunze came Helmuth, Varin, and Bokum, later Schaefer, Seidensticker, and Learned. Moreover, in William and Mary College Jefferson had introduced modern languages as early as 1779,[12] while King's College (Columbia University) also offered these languages at an early date, before 1768. But details are lacking. Castañeda reports that Salem College in North Carolina introduced German, probably on a tutorial basis, in 1771.

In Nazareth, Pennsylvania, an all-German Moravian academy was started in 1756, later (1785) reorganized as a boys' boarding school. It lasted through half of the nineteenth century and later accepted also non-Germans and Indians. And in Germantown English and German residents cooperated to found an academy in 1760 with English and German departments. In both schools German was on a par with English, and in Nazareth the pupils were "required to express themselves exclusively in one or the other language on alternate days in their intercourse with each other and their preceptors."[13] In New England, however, where academies also developed (Phillips Andover was started in 1778 and Phillips Exeter in 1781), modern languages were taught at an early date but do not seem to have become a regular part of the curriculum until the later nineteenth century (Bagster-Collins, p. 13). A notable exception, the Round Hill School, will be discussed in the next section.

II. FROM THE REVOLUTIONARY WAR TO 1825

With the German Institute of the College and the German Seminary, both in Philadelphia, mentioned in the previous section, we have already entered the period of the American Revolution. The war affected education unfavorably and, because of the presence of Hessian and Hanoverian mercenaries, even though they were impressed against their will into the British Colonial Army, German and the Germans soon became unpopular. Moreover, since some of the colonial ports were blockaded part of the time, few ships with emigrants could come through, with the result that scarcely more than 6,000 arrived from anywhere each year during this period. Crude efforts at forced Americanization also militated against newcomers from Germany and Switzerland.

As we have seen, the Seminary became a victim of the war. The Institute, however, did not come to an end until 1787. In spite of the enthusiasm of Justus Helmuth, who succeeded Kunze, of a gold medal promised annually by the German Society for the best essay on a theme relating to the Germans in Pennsylvania,[1] and of an article in the *Philadelphia-Correspondenz* in 1783 advocating public schools in which German would be taught, the Institute was forced to close its doors because its enrollment had dropped from sixty to six. This step had to be taken in spite of the expert teaching which had made it possible for the students to read and appreciate so difficult a recent work as Lessing's *Nathan der Weise*, published in 1779.

There was yet another reason for this: dissension and competitive efforts on the part of the Germans of Pennsylvania themselves. Shortly after the installation of a teacher of German, John Daniel Gross, S.T.D., at Columbia College in New York in 1784 (a position which he held for eleven years), and the founding of the Methodist Cokesbury College in 1785 in Maryland, where French and German were to be taught "when the finances of the college will permit" (Handschin, p. 32), a group of Pennsylvania Germans founded Franklin College in 1787 in Lancaster as a rival of the Institute. They had succeeded in interesting the now aged Benjamin Franklin in the plan, naming the college in his honor and appointing Henry Mühlenberg president. The teacher of German was Rev. Frederick Melsheimer, a native of Braunschweig (Castañeda, loc. cit.). Franklin's part in the founding of the college was described by Provost Pepper of what is now Franklin and Marshall College[2] in an address in 1891.

For a long time he had taken great interest in the welfare of the Germans, who formed the bulk of the population in some parts of Pennsylvania. He aided in the establishment of schools for them, and served as a trustee of a society for the benefit of the poor among them, and in 1787, although in his eighty-first year, he was active in the promotion of the long-cherished scheme of founding a college for the education of young Germans. On March 10 of that year—1787—an act was passed by the assembly incorporating and endowing the German College and Charity School in the borough and county of Lancaster, in which act it is recited that "the college is established for the instruction of youth in the German, English, Latin, Greek, and other learned languages, in theology, and in the useful arts, sciences, and literature." The same act of incorporation states that, "from a profound respect for the talents, virtues, and services to mankind in general, but more especially to this country, of his excellency Benjamin Franklin, esq., president of the supreme executive council, Franklin was the largest

[11] *Notes on the History of Foreign Influence on Education*, in the *Report of Commissioner of Education for 1898*, I, 604. Quoted by Viereck, p. 543. On Franklin and Germany, see the University of Pennsylvania dissertation by B. M. Victory (*Americana-Germanica*, No. 21, 1915), also D. V. Hegeman in *German Quarterly*, XXVI, 187 *f.*

[12] See Introduction, footnote 6. The teacher was Carlo Bellini, who taught French, Italian, Spanish, and possibly German.

[13] W. C. Reichel, *Historical Sketch of Nazareth Hall*, Bethlehem, 1876, p. 11. Quoted by Bagster-Collins, p. 13.

[1] The first subject was: "How can the preservation and extension of German in Pennsylvania be best effected?" See Viereck, p. 545.

[2] Marshall College of Mercersburg had been merged with Franklin College in 1850. Viereck quotes from Pepper's address, pp. 545 ff.

contributor to its funds, giving of his moderate fortune the sum of $1,000, which may be considered large for those days; and still more when, in the spring of 1787 the corner stone was to be laid in Lancaster, he underwent the pain and fatigue of a journey thither in order to perform that ceremony.

However, the time was not yet ripe for a college of this kind, German had lost some of its appeal, Lancaster was situated too far west, and the Germans of Pennsylvania had been divided by a schism. The result was bad for all concerned. The College had lost its German instruction in the Institute, although Helmuth was permitted to stay on, and "Franklin College also cast off its German tegument" soon, to use Handschin's phrase (p. 32). On the credit side, it is to be borne in mind that Franklin College did not quite go under and later could reinstate its German instruction, and that if it had not been founded, one of America's earliest great scientists might not have attained such prominence. He is Benjamin Smith Barton.

To Barton seems to go the distinction of having been the first American to secure a degree at a German university. Born in Lancaster in 1766, he studied at the College in Philadelphia. In 1787 he journeyed home to witness the laying of the cornerstone of Franklin College by Franklin himself. This so impressed him that he decided to pursue his studies in medicine and science abroad. He first attended the University of Edinburgh, then continued his studies in London, and finally secured his medical degree in Göttingen. Back in Philadelphia he enjoyed a very distinguished career as a physician, a scientific investigator, and a writer. His early study of German at home helped shape this notable career.

A plan for a national university, advocated by Jefferson and worked out in some detail by Dr. Benjamin Rush in 1788, provided for instruction in French and German. But it came to naught.

Turning for a moment to the South, we find that in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, a certain W. A. Richards taught modern languages as early as 1795 or 1796. The university had been founded in the former year. On the first diploma, dated September 22, 1796, his name appears as a teacher of French and English, but according to Kemp P. Battle in his *History of the University of North Carolina*,[3] Richards taught German, too. But it is not clear whether this was in the university or in the preparatory school attached to it. More likely, though, it was in both. During the same period, Transylvania College in Kentucky introduced the modern languages in 1794 and Williams College in Massachusetts in 1795 (Castañeda, p. 8).

Among the private academies foreign language instruction was by no means common in the earlier periods. Washington Academy in Virginia, to be [illegible]fered it as early as 1799. New England had almost 150 academies by 1825, and there is some evidence of French instruction in Phillips Exeter, for instance, but not of German. But in the Round Hill School in Northampton, Mass., founded in 1823 by the historian Bancroft and the bibliographer Cogswell, who had studied in Germany, and modelled on German educational patterns, all the students learned German. It existed for fifteen years. Late in 1824 Charles Follen and Charles Beck, two political refugees, just arrived from Germany, were invited to teach at Round Hill. Follen, with a recommendation from Lafayette, had been there less than a year when he was invited to Harvard. His father had called himself Follenius, but the son, born near Giessen in 1769, dropped the Latin ending in America.[4]

In New York State, which had about 650 pupils in such academies by 1805, no evidence of German instruction appears before 1825, but in the South, particularly in North Carolina, it seems to have been more frequent, though second to French. In Illinois and other parts of the Middle West, academies did not begin appearing until after 1815, but foreign languages did not enter the curriculum until some twenty-five years later (Bagster-Collins, pp. 13 ff.). German instruction in centers like Cincinnati began regularly in the elementary school. It will receive attention in the next section. The case of the Salem (Pennsylvania) Female Academy, founded in 1804, is unusual; it introduced German at its very inception.

The revived interest in Germany and German literature from about 1815 on, when a new generation had grown up to whom the War of Independence was not a personal experience, can probably be explained also by the work of Mme de Staël, already referred to, by Carlyle's writings, and by the activities of men like George Ticknor and Edward Everett. French had been taught at Harvard in desultory fashion as early as 1733. The first licensed German teacher there was Meno Poehls in 1816. But he taught at Harvard only one year, more or less as a tutor, and his subject was not a part of the regular inflexible curriculum.[5]

In the next year, though, Ticknor was appointed professor of French and Spanish. He assumed his post in 1819. Although he did not teach German, his influence in introducing European ideas of academic freedom for both faculty and students, his great administrative ability, and his broad vision and interest in German, as well as the literatures which he professed, had a profound and lasting effect upon the whole academic life at Cambridge.

But the status of the foreign languages was only that of an elective subject. In the *Fourth Annual Report of the President of Harvard University* for 1828-29 (pp. xxiii ff.) we read: "The principles which regulate the study of the modern languages are these: No student is compelled to study any of them. A student, choosing to study either, is compelled to persevere. He is not permitted to quit the study until he has learned the language" (Bagster-Collins, p. 56). Nevertheless, Ticknor had no trouble recruiting a modest number of students.

Before continuing our consideration of Harvard, it is necessary to turn to two other New England colleges, Amherst and Bowdoin, and to the University of Virginia.

At Amherst thoroughgoing German instruction was started in 1824, but not as a subject in the regular course of study. It was, however, recognized as a legitimate subject if taken extramurally. In Bowdoin College instruction was offered in the modern languages as early as 1820. But a profesorship in that subject was not established until 1826, when a bequest of one thousand dollars was received for this purpose. A certain J. H. Abbott was engaged to teach them. Then in 1829 Henry Wadsworth Longfellow was elected professor in this field. He took up his duties the next year, after his return from a protracted sojourn abroad. According to one of the College catalogs of the time "the student may at his option study the Ancient, or one of the Modern Languages, Spanish, German, or Italian, instead of the calculus" (Bagster-Collins, p. 52). It was an option of which those weak in mathematics availed themselves freely.

In 1819 Thomas Jefferson's plan for a University of Virginia was approved by the state legislature. The course of study allowed the student full liberty of attending any lectures in any subject,

[3] Raleigh, 1907, p. 115. See Bagster-Collins, pp. 54 ff. Richards, a Londoner, had come to America as a sailor, skipped ship, was an actor for a while, and then became a tutor.

[4] A rich mine of information on Follen is George W. Spindler's *The Life of Karl Follen, A Study in German-American Cultural Relations* (Historical Monograph publ. under the auspices of the German-American Hist. Soc. of Ill., No. 1), Chicago, 1917.

[5] Bagster-Collins, p. 50. The often bitter contest between the ancient and the modern languages continued through three-fourths of the nineteenth century. Ticknor delighted in breaking a lance for the modern tongues (e.g., in his *Remarks*, 1825, and in his *Lecture on the Best Methods of Teaching the Living Languages*, Boston, 1833). Yale usually supported the classics, while Harvard was a bit more friendly toward the modern languages, as were the younger universities like Michigan and Cornell. Bold advocacy of French and German by F.A.P. Barnard in 1866 was also a strong factor in their favor.

and the curriculum of general studies was built around the study of German, no doubt the result of Jefferson's close personal contacts with Alexander von Humboldt. In 1818, a year before the charter was granted, Jefferson had reported to the legislature: "The German now stands in a line with that of the most learned nations in richness of condition and advance in the sciences. It is, too, of common descent with the language of our own country, a branch of the same original Gothic stock, and furnishes valuable illustrations for us" (Viereck, p. 552). Jefferson's plan was to have Ticknor accept the chair of modern languages at a salary of $2,500 (which today would probably be the equivalent of $25,000), but Ticknor, though approving heartily of the idea, preferred to remain in Massachusetts. Instead, a German linguist, Dr. George Blaettermann, was given the position, which he assumed in 1825 and held for fifteen years. Compared with an ancient language enrollment of 57 in the first year, 73 were enrolled in the general studies division of modern languages.

In 1825, too, as we have seen, Harvard resumed instruction in German with the appointment of Follen. His class in German was at first experimental. Concerning it a member of his first class, Andrew P. Peabody, writes in his *Harvard Reminiscences* (Boston, 1888, p. 117):

> German had never been taught in college before, and it was with no little difficulty that a volunteer class of eight was formed. I was one of that class. We were looked upon with very much the amazement with which a class in some obscure tribal dialect of the remotest Orient would be now regarded. We knew of but two or three persons in New England who could read German, though there were probably many more of whom we did not know. There were no German books in the bookstores. A friend gave me a copy of Schiller's "Wallenstein," which I read as soon as I was able to do so, and then passed it from hand to hand among those who could obtain nothing else to read. There was no attainable class book that could be used as a "reader." A few copies of Nöhden's Grammar were imported, and a few copies of I forget whose "pocket dictionary," fortunately [sic] too copious for an Anglo-Saxon pocket, and suggesting the generous amplitude of the Low Dutch costume, as described in Irving's mythical "History of New York." The German Reader for Beginners, compiled by our teacher, was furnished to the class in single sheets as it was needed, and was printed in Roman type, there being no German type within easy reach. There could not have been a happier introduction to German literature than this little volume. It contained choice extracts in prose, all from writers that still hold an unchallenged place in the hierarchy of Genius, and poems from Schiller, Goethe, Herder, and several other poets of kindred, if inferior, fame. But in the entire volume Dr. Follen rejoiced especially in several battle poems from Körner, the soldier and martyr of liberty. I have never heard recitations which impressed me so strongly as the reading of those pieces by Dr. Follen, who would put into them all of the heart and soul that made him too much a lover of his country to be suffered to dwell in it. He appended to the other poems in the first edition of the reader, anonymously, a death song in memory of Körner, which we all knew to be his own, and which we read so often and so feelingly that it sank indelibly into permanent memory, and I find that, after an interval of sixty years, it is as fresh in my recollection as the hymns that I learned in my childhood. (Quoted also by Viereck, p. 553)

It is likely that the gift of a set of Goethe's works by Goethe himself to the Harvard Library in 1819 served also as a fillip to German studies.

By and large, however, the quality of teaching was low in the field of modern languages, and continued so for several generations. Many of the teachers enjoyed only the advantage of being native to the language taught, but had little ability as teachers. Their teaching load was usually quite heavy, as many as seven or eight hours a day, and their salaries were lower than those paid in other fields. Furthermore the courses sometimes did not even carry credit, or at best half-credit (Bagster-Collins, p. 58). Consequently the enrollment in German was low as a rule. As noted above, Peabody spoke of a class of eight at Harvard in 1825-26. Bagster-Collins' figures (p. 57) are a trifle higher. Follen also taught a larger class in Boston.

As for textbooks, it was also noted by Peabody that Follen compiled his own reader as the class progressed. Nöhden, also mentioned by Peabody, was the author of a German grammar as well as a reader, the former based upon the old German work of Adelung. Both of Nöhden's books were commonly used in England. Besides Schiller's *Wallenstein*, *Maria Stuart* and the *History of the Thirty Years' War* were read a few years later, by the time the class was farther advanced, also Goethe's *Faust*, Part 1 (Bagster-Collins, p. 59). The subject of early textbooks will be continued in the next section.

III. AN UPHILL STRUGGLE: 1826-76

The fifty years to be considered here will take us from the time of Follen's tenure at Harvard to the founding of the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, where the scientific study of the German language and literature—called "Germanistik" in German—was stressed in this country. We shall open the present section with a look at some of the early textbooks.

As noted in Section II, Follen was seriously handicapped by the lack of suitable textbooks when he came to Cambridge in December of 1825 and early the next year took up the teaching of German on an experimental basis. So he set to work immediately and wrote his *Deutsches Lesebuch für Anfänger* (Cambridge, 1826), a book of 250 pages. As the preface states, the author's purpose was to furnish reading matter from recognized German masterpieces, in illustration of the rules and genius of the language, and to give the students a foretaste and first impression of the classical literature. There follows an introduction which offers a brief history of German literature, divided into three periods: Medieval, Reformation, and Modern (the earliest sketch of German literature, perhaps, to appear in America). The selections themselves cover 150 pages of prose and twenty of poetry ranging from Lessing to Theodor Körner. Among the works represented by selections are: Lessing's fables, Herder's *Paramythien*, Schiller's *Geisterseher* and *Abfall der Niederlande*, Novalis' *Heinrich von Ofterdingen*, Wackenroder's *Herzensergiessungen*, Goethe's *Italienische Reise* and *Wilhelm Meister*, Wieland's *Abderiten*, Jean Paul's novels, and A. W. Schlegel's lecture on *Macbeth*. There is no end vocabulary, but considerable other help, including superior numbers to clarify word order, e.g., "Es ist nicht angemessen, die Götter in Wände ein zu schliessen." As in most of the textbooks of that time, the printing is crowded and unattractive. How an average modern college freshman with no knowledge of German would be baffled by the difficulty of the language and thought! How he would rebel at the fare which his ancestor, five or six generations removed, was expected to digest!

Nevertheless this book, warmly received by the reviewers, is a landmark in the early college curriculum, as Spindler aptly says.[1] It was still used at Harvard as late as the sixties (the twenty-first edition appeared in 1859) and instilled in generations of Americans an enthusiasm for German literature. In 1833 Follen anonymously published a sequel for more advanced study. It contained Schiller's *Maria Stuart* and Goethe's *Egmont* as well as *Torquato Tasso*, without any critical matter. Much of the textual material was furnished Follen by his colleague Ticknor, who possessed an excellent German library. Five years before, Follen had got out his *Practical Grammar of the German Language* (Boston, 1828), another landmark, and an improvement over the British works of Nöhden and Rowbotham. A preface gives an historical account of the development of the German language and observations on German grammars from Gottsched to Grimm. The main body of the book is in three parts: Elements, Syntax, and Prosody. Spindler comments as follows (p. 102):

> The Elements are divided into orthography and parts

[1] See footnote 4 in Section II. The reference is on p. 100. See also the reviews there.

of speech. In his classification of consonants Follen deviated from general usage by ranking d, t, l and n with the palatals and r with the linguals. In dealing with the parts of speech he begins with the article and treats successively nouns, adjectives, numerals, pronouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions and conjunctions. Similar to Heinsius' scheme of declension, he groups the nouns into three classes: all feminines; all masculines having the genitive singular in n or en; and all masculines and neuters whose genitive singular ends in s (s, es, us, eus). In dealing with the verb, the primary tenses, then the secondary are treated; but instead of adopting the new terms 'weak' and 'strong,' as introduced by Grimm, those of 'regular' and 'irregular' are retained. The treatise on prosody, based for the most part on the opinions of Voss and Schlegel, was introduced "in order to contribute to the pleasure of those lovers of poetry," who were becoming interested more and more in the polite literature of Germany.

Judged by modern standards, the work is quite heavy, overly literary and dull. Such trite sentences as this are assigned for translation: "The hen sees the kite in the air and gathers the chickens under her wings."

Finally, Follen's edition of the Gospel of St. John for beginners in German, with a literal English interlinear translation, deserves mention.

With a look at two other widely used textbooks of the same period, issued in Philadelphia in 1832, we will close our study of early German primers. Both are by Hermann Bokum, who was then instructor in the German language and literature at the University of Pennsylvania.

The first, a second edition of which appeared soon, is *An Introduction to the Study of the German Language* "comprising extracts from the best German prose writers with an English interlinear translation, explanatory notes, and a treatise on pronunciation affording the means of a ready and accurate comparison of the idioms of the two languages." It contains about 200 pages. The preface notes that since German is learned in this country "generally only for a practical purpose," this book too pursues a practical end. It pays a tribute to Follen (though he is not named): Bokum hopes his book will become a stimulus to "a careful study of the excellent productions which, emanating from Cambridge, have been greatly conducive to a more general cultivation of German literature." Independently of Follen he offers twenty-three selections, among them passages from Jean Paul, Wieland (*Die Abderiten*), Goethe (*Egmont, Wilhelm Meister*), Schiller (*Geschichte des dreissigjährigen Krieges*), Fichte, Lichtenberg, Lessing, Gessner, Wackenroder, and Tieck, all in prose. In presenting them he goes Follen one better. The first 140 pages give these selections in English word order, e.g.: "Vielleicht Wolken werden bedecken ihn zuweilen . . . ," with the English equivalents underneath. In the case of such an expression as "vor vielen Jahren," the explanation reads: "before many years (ago)." Then on the last sixty pages the same texts are unscrambled and given in idiomatic German.

The second book of Bokum is a slightly revised edition of a grammar by Adolphus Bernays (London, 1830) and bears the title *Bernays' Compendious German Grammar* "with a dictionary of prefixes and affixes, and with alterations, additions and references to an introduction to the study of the German language." It is anything but compendious, consisting of only sixty pages. After the alphabet and sounds (for "lingual ch" the only "help" given is: "like Spanish x in *xifero;*" for guttural ch: "like j in Spanish *oveja* or ch in Scotch *loch*"), the substantives are treated, followed by the pronouns, articles, adjectives, numerals, verbs (*sein* still spelled *seyn*), adverbs, prepositions, syntax, word order, and miscellaneous addenda such as the pleonastic use of *nicht* then still in vogue: "es ist mehr als ein Monat, seitdem er nicht geschrieben hat." Word formation is briefly treated, and an eight-page "dictionary of prefixes and suffixes" concludes the book.

As in all the books considered thus far, the presswork is abominable. In the tiny volume under discussion, with the page measuring only 7⅛ by 4¼ inches, there are eighty ems to the line and 53 lines normally to the page. In the list of verbs, the font is so minute that about 65 verbs are crowded into a one-page column, so small that one may need a glass to decipher them. There are no exercises whatever, as the book is meant to be a reference grammar.

We return for a moment to Follen. Realizing almost from the start that his position in Cambridge was precarious and still hoping to get into the more congenial field of ethics and morality, he became a Unitarian minister in 1828, but continued teaching German at Harvard. Two years later he acquired American citizenship. Learning in 1830 that he was not to become professor of ethics at Harvard, as he had been led to believe, he accepted the new professorship of German literature, a post which he held from 1831 to 1836. But although he proved very popular with his students, his appointment was not renewed for another term, probably because of his anti-slavery agitation and championship of free speech. In the autumn of 1836 he took the post as minister of the First Unitarian Church in New York.

Hardly had Follen left Harvard when Longfellow returned from Europe to take up the position of Ticknor at Harvard. He served as professor of modern languages there from 1836 to 1854. Although German literature was not his sole specific field, the lectures on Goethe which he began in 1838 were particularly noteworthy. But generally speaking, the teaching of modern languages and literatures remained what it had been, a sort of tutorial sideline or extra-curricular activity (see Handschin, p. 37). The remark made by Follen in 1831: "There are now German teachers and German books in all important cities in this country" was to a degree true enough. But as far as language teaching was concerned, Latin and Greek still remained in the saddle, and the ability to use a few phrases of French and to puzzle out a few pages of it was considered a polite accomplishment.

With Follen and, soon after, Longfellow, Harvard undoubtedly snatched away any hegemony that the University of Pennsylvania may have enjoyed up to then, so far as the teaching of German is concerned. We have noted that this new prestige impressed even Herr Bokum in Philadelphia. Institutions of collegiate rank directly north of Pennsylvania seem also to have been impressed. After an interregnum from the time of Gross's retirement in 1795, Columbia appointed Frederick C. Shafer, S.T.D., to teach German in 1830, and in 1844 J. L. Tellkampf, J.U.D., became the first Gebhard professor there in that subject. Theologians, lawyers, and men of many other professions could become Germanists overnight in those days. At Princeton, where there is some evidence that German was taught late in the eighteenth century, the newly formed alumni association provided for a "professorship of living languages" in 1830 and Benedict Jaeger became professor of German and Italian. As in almost all cases, however, the subject was purely voluntary and extra-curricular.[3] Yale appointed a teacher of German in 1831 (for one year); the position became more stable in 1834. But German did not gain real distinction at Yale until 1856, when William D. Whitney added German to Sanskrit and enriched the teaching possibilities with his excellent grammar, reader, and dictionary. His daughter Marian became equally famous later at Vassar.

The Sheffield Scientific School at Yale had a modern language requirement in 1846, while Brown gave its first modern language instruction in 1844, and Amherst in 1846. At least two collegiate institutions in the Middle West began teaching Ger-

[3] Handschin, p. 37, quotes from the report of a Princeton alumnus (class of 1853) on the failure of the university to provide adequate training in the modern foreign languages as late as the middle of the nineteenth century. However, it is noteworthy that the famous classical philologist, Basil L. Gildersleeve, laid the groundwork for his excellent knowledge of German at Princeton as early as 1847.

man even earlier, Miami of Ohio around 1830, and Woodward College in Cincinnati in 1837 under Dr. Wilhelm Nast, the founder of German Methodism, who had already taught German at Gettysburg Seminary in Pennsylvania.[3]

The most popular college textbooks during the era of the fifties were, besides those of Follen and Bokum, the *Grammar and Exercises*, as well as the *Reader* of Ollendorff, the *Reader* of Rölker, Otto's *Conversational Grammar*, and Ahn's grammar. With Ollendorff, Otto, and Ahn, we note a more natural approach to the language, more conversational in tone and down-to-earth, with greater stress on every-day speech. But the grammar-translation method still prevailed. Popular for reading were selections from Jean Paul, Schiller's *Maria Stuart* and *Die Jungfrau von Orleans*, as well as his historical writings, Goethe's *Egmont* and *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, and selections from *Faust*, Part I. Then in the sixties the books of Whitney and Woodbury were widely adopted. Contemporaneous German writers hardly took root until Heine, Gerstäcker (who, by the way, was in America in the forties and applied for a position as a teacher of German in Cincinnati), Heyse, Storm, and others became better known.

But we must leave the collegiate field for the time being and turn to the teaching of German in the private and public elementary and high schools. Three types of German private schools can be distinguished in the United States at the beginning of the nineteenth century: those of a denominational nature that wanted to perpetuate the German language for family reasons, non-denominational schools based upon the conviction that knowledge of a second language (in particular that of one's forbears) has educational value, and finally those that aimed to transplant to America the system of education which prevailed in Germany and which the better educated German emigrants (especially from 1848 on) deemed superior to that to be had in the American public schools of the time. Often the two latter types were blended in a single school.

The first type has been considered, but the other two, some examples of which endured until the twentieth century, must now be taken up. One of the best illustrations of the strong influence of German upon the educational system of an American city is furnished by Cincinnati. Since 1835 German schools existed there, such as the German Protestant "Emigrant School" (1836), attached to the Lane Seminary, and parochial schools. The teaching of German was introduced in the elementary public schools of the city in 1840 and, though strongly opposed at first, it attracted many children of German families. There was a special reason for this move. In 1836 the Ohio legislature had sent the theologian Professor Calvin E. Stowe of Cincinnati to Europe to study the school systems of various countries. In that same year Stowe had married Harriet Beecher, who was to achieve wide fame as the author of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. He returned with a very favorable estimate of the Prussian schools, and many of his recommendations were adopted, not only in Ohio, but in Pennsylvania as well.[4] Consequently the quality of the schools in these states was improved and German instruction introduced. Indeed, an Ohio statute of 1842 provided that "a German youth may, if German is not taught in his school district, attend in another district . . ." (Handschin, p. 70).

The German instruction in Cincinnati was optional, and during the early period (but not later)[5] it was restricted to children of German parentage, a form of segregation which, some years later, was sharply attacked in other places, for instance in St. Louis. Like Baltimore, Buffalo, Chicago, Cleveland, Dayton, Denver, Indianapolis, Milwaukee, New York, San Francisco, St. Paul, and Toledo, St. Louis also came around to offering German in its elementary public schools.[6] Even as late as 1914 one-third of the entire Cincinnati elementary school population was learning German throughout the entire eight years. The same situation prevailed in Cleveland, Dayton, and Milwaukee, with others mentioned above not far behind. Until 1917 the Cincinnati school administration had a special staff in charge of German.

The types of class organization, from the point of view of teaching in the German-English schools, were threefold. In Cincinnati, for instance, there was one class teacher in the German schools, and he gave instruction in both languages, sometimes to the prejudice of English. But the German-English schools either had special teachers of German or developed the so-called "parallel-class system," whereby all the pupils who elected German were taught a half day alternately by an English and by a German teacher up to and including the fourth grade. Officially stated, the plan in vogue in Cincinnati in 1914 was as follows: "In the lower grades of the larger schools two teachers were assigned to two classes, one teaching German and the other English to both classes alternately, the German teacher in addition taking charge of such branches as drawing, music, and primary occupation work. The upper grades were generally taught by a German supervising assistant."[7] When the school was small, a few special teachers took charge of all the German, and as such they were regularly employed staff members. By and large this system prevailed in Cincinnati from 1840 to 1917, employing three teachers in 1840 and over 175 by 1914. In other cities very similar arrangements were in vogue, at least for a while, until teacher shortages, budgetary demands, or better counsel dictated otherwise.

As for the quality of teaching and the amount of time devoted to it, Handschin, writing a year before the outbreak of World War I, has the following to say (p. 72): "This instruction in Cincinnati, perhaps the best and most thorough-going of its kind now in the United States, deserves special notice. . . . The time given to German instruction in such classes (i.e., the "parallel classes") does not exceed nine hours a week (in the first four grades). . . . From the fourth to the eighth grades 45 minutes to one hour a day are devoted to German. The instruction, as the writer knows from personal inspection, is very good. The pupils who elect the German keep up their other work very satisfactorily, and no change seems to be desired."

In other cities even more time was devoted to German. As Bagster-Collins remarks (p. 20): "The equal division of time between English and German, such as we found in the Cleveland schools of 1869-70, represents the high-water mark in the development of German instruction in this country." In general this bilingual nature of many of the schools caused administrators in many cities no end of trouble and some expense.

In New York City German was introduced on an optional basis in the highest grade of the grammar school in 1854, and in 1870 the course was lengthened to the entire eight years. By the mid-seventies there were about 20,000 children enrolled in German. There existed also purely German schools of a private nature in New York as late

[3] The last two paragraphs are based chiefly on Handschin and Bagster-Collins.

[4] The Pennsylvania school law of 1237, a direct outgrowth of the Stowe report, placed German public schools on a par with English schools and established some purely German schools. In Ohio the State Legislature passed an Act in 1840 requiring all Boards of Education to introduce German when demanded by seventy-five "freeholders" representing forty or more pupils. I am to write a more detailed account of German teaching in Cincinnati for the Ohio Historical and Philosophical Society. Much early material on the subject is to be found in *A History of the Schools of Cincinnati* by John B. Shotwell, Cincinnati, 1902, especially pp. 289-310.

[5] I recall meeting Cincinnatians who were not of German extraction—Irish and negroes among them—but who had learned German in school and could converse in it.

[6] St. Louis introduced German in its elementary schools in 1864, Chicago in 1865, Cleveland before 1870, Baltimore in 1874. Others are noted by Handschin, pp. 72 ff. See especially his chronology, pp. 73 f.

[7] *Cincinnati Public Schools, 85th Annual Report*, 1914, p. 68.

as the eighties, in which not even the teachers had an adequate command of English.

As late as 1857 the school reports in Pennsylvania and Indiana were published in German translation; in New Jersey this practice persisted until 1888. And in 1870 the U.S. Commissioner of Education reported (p. 55) that "the German language has actually become the second language of our Republic, and a knowledge of German is now considered essential to a finished education."

In a similar vein U. T. Curran, president of the Ohio Teachers' Association in 1873, told the body at its twenty-fifth annual meeting:

> Without doubt, the English will be the language of this country. But the law authorizes the teaching of German in our schools, and it is highly proper that it should be taught. The memories of fatherland are sweet, and the sound of the mother tongue on the lips of the child makes the father feel that his child is not separated from him. The vast storehouse of the German needs but this key to place its riches at the command of him who can use it. There are difficulties presented in the management of our schools where two languages are taught at once. The best experience has taught us that the lines of instruction should be parallel.
>
> The power of thinking in two languages will counterbalance any supposed deficiency in either, and the two languages will give, in their reciprocal influence upon each other, linguistic culture, and will render pupils better trained than those who have drawled through the abstract formulae of so-called English grammar. (Handschin, pp. 53 ff.)

Perhaps even more enthusiastic about the benefits of the study of German in the elementary schools, specifically those in Cincinnati, was John B. Peaslee, superintendent of schools there from 1874 to 1887, who addressed the Nationaler Deutsch-Amerikanischer Lehrerbund at Chicago July 19, 1889, on "Instruction in German and its helpful influence on common school education as experienced in the public schools of Cincinnati."[8]

And yet, even in its heyday between 1852 and 1854, when a total of over 500,000 persons of German tongue arrived, and again between 1866 and 1873, when close to 150,000 poured into the United States every year,[9] German instruction did not go unchallenged. Many voices were raised against what was termed its exaggerated emphasis, and crimination was followed by recrimination, with the bad feelings that naturally attended.

If the teaching of German during the greater part of the nineteenth century to thousands of young Americans in hundreds of elementary public and private schools represents one of the most singular phenomena in the history of education in this country, and well illustrates what democracy can lead to in the classroom, the situation in the high school field was quite different. Here it was largely a question of teaching a foreign language as such, not of according a special privilege to a huge segment of the population.

The first public high school of which we have any record was opened in Boston in 1821, but German does not seem to have been taught there until thirty years later. In the Free Academy in New York City, however, out of which later grew the College of the City of New York, German was found in the curriculum as early as 1838; in a Philadelphia high school, probably in 1839; in Hartford, Connecticut, in 1847, at the parents' expense. But the first strong impetus to the teaching of the language on the high-school level was given by the immigration of the political refugees from 1848 on. In 1849 Massilon, Ohio, introduced German in its high school, around 1850 Boston, then in 1853 Cincinnati (a three-year course optional with French), followed by Dorchester, Mass. (1854), Newburyport (1855), Lancaster, Ohio, and Cleveland (1856). In the sixties it could also be found in Newark, N.J., Toledo, Ohio, Terre Haute, St. Louis, New Haven, and Louisville.[10]

In 1850 there were thirty-six academies in New York State teaching German, as compared with 148 teaching French, but by 1870 German had all but caught up (140 to 147). In Baltimore, however, where German had been introduced in the public high school as early as the forties, 173 pupils were learning German in 1852, as against 52 in French and 39 in Spanish. And for twenty years from 1867 on German was the only modern foreign language taught in the Central High School of Philadelphia, according to Bagster-Collins (p. 29). From 1860 to 1875 the high schools of the Middle West that we know of had more pupils in German than in French, the ratio being five to two (Bagster-Collins, p. 30).

By the sixties the modern languages had won a recognized though modest place in the curriculum of the better American high schools and academies. The teaching, however, was greatly in need of improvement in more than half of the schools. One of its chief weaknesses was that it came too much under the influence of collegiate instruction. The texts used (e.g., those of Follen, Ollendorff, Otto, Ahn, and Whitney) and the works read (of Lessing, Goethe, and Schiller) were more suitable for use in college, and many indeed were edited by college professors. And the teachers were either trained by the same class of instructors, or they were ill prepared, often enlisted from other subjects to help out simply because they had studied German for two or three years at college. What Handschin said about this deficiency almost fifty years ago (pp. 56 ff.) is still true today, at least in part.

Realizing these shortcomings, some of the leaders in the profession decided to organize the teachers of German both in the elementary and secondary schools, with a view to bringing about much needed improvements. And so in 1870 the *Nationaler Deutsch-Americanischer Lehrerbund* was organized in Louisville. Its organ, first called *Die amerikanische Schulzeitung* (1870), was replaced by *Erziehungsblätter für Schule und Haus* (1874), then by *Die pädagogischen Monatshefte* (1899), later by *Monatshefte für deutsche Sprache und Pädagogik* (1906), then *Monatshefte für deutschen Unterricht,* finally abbreviated to *Monatshefte* (now published by the Department of German of the University of Wisconsin). A teachers' seminary was established in Milwaukee which served as a model of its kind for several generations; it was finally merged with the aforementioned department of the University of Wisconsin.

We close this section with a brief reference to a few major developments in the field of university instruction and research. In 1870 Harvard launched its Graduate School modestly but auspiciously. The University of Michigan inaugurated seminar training (first in the field of history) in 1871, but it had been offering beginners' French since 1847 and began German (a course taking two-thirds of a year) in 1849. In a scientific course begun in 1852, a year of German was required. Michigan advertised a regular M.A. for residence work in 1858.[11]

Harvard granted its first doctorate of philosophy in 1873, Michigan in 1876, not in German linguistics or literature, however.[12] But the most important step of all was the founding of the Johns Hopkins University at Baltimore in 1876. Here graduate work in the humanities as in other fields could be undertaken in earnest. Here, where German was called "the court language of the university," original research in Germanics found a home in the New World.

IV. AN ERA OF SELF-EXAMINATION: 1876-99

It seems to be axiomatic that when a profession has grown mature enough to organize, as the

[8] Published as a pamphlet.

[9] It is estimated that between 1820 and 1910 about six million Germans immigrated to the United States.

[10] See Handschin's table, p. 54; see also Bagster-Collins, pp. 28 ff.

[11] See *The University of Michigan—an Encyclopedic Survey,* Part III: "The Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures" by Norman L. Willey, and a typed manuscript of 31 pp. by Willey in the files of the Michigan German Dept.

[12] On this subject see the last paragraphs in Section IV.

teachers of German did in 1870 with the establishment of the *Nationaler Deutsch-Amerikanischer Lehrerbund*, it soon begins to grow introspective. This is undoubtedly the tendency manifested, especially in the eighties and nineties, by the American teachers of the modern foreign languages and the teachers of German in particular. In the present case maturity also brought with it a higher degree of self-assertion. And so we find that estimable pioneer in the field of German studies, Professor E. S. Joynes, co-author of the much-used Joynes-Meisnest grammar and editor of the Holt edition of Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, pleading before the National Education Association in 1876: "... that the modern languages be elevated from the merely tutorial position which they have so often occupied, to a rank and dignity in our higher institutions of learning commensurate with their disciplinary value, with their literary importance, and with their intimate relations to our own language, history and nation" (Handschin, p. 40). The address of Professor Joynes was widely distributed and exercised a lasting influence. As a matter of fact, the tenor of his plea was already "in the air" before he had uttered it, for in 1875 Harvard had introduced its entrance requirement of French or German, destined soon to be widely copied. And seven years after Joynes's plea came an eloquent protest of Charles Francis Adams against the fetish of Greek in our schools.

The Modern Language Association of America was founded in December 1883, an important landmark, not only in research in the literary and linguistic problems of this field, but also in the promotion of the study of the various foreign languages coming within its purview. As we shall see, the latter phase of the Association's interest, very strong during its earlier years, then dropped almost completely for a while, is now once more in the foreground.

Very soon after its establishment the Association commissioned two reports on "the present condition of instruction in modern languages in American colleges" (1884), one for the North, the other for the "late Confederate States." In the report for the North we read that the entrance requirement, if any, is too meager (only elementary grammar); the writers urge beginning the foreign language at an early age and state that in about one-half of the colleges canvassed the language is not begun until the sophomore or junior year. Over one-third of the colleges have no foreign language requirement at all, and German, the report goes on to say, is at a disadvantage compared to French. Finally, the so-called Latin-scientific or philosophy course is called preferable to the arts course because it leaves more opportunity for study of foreign language. The report on the southern states reveals conditions inferior to those in the North but lays the blame chiefly upon the dearth of preparatory schools (Handschin, pp. 41 ff.).

The next report of some consequence was that of a commission appointed in 1886 by fifteen New England colleges, one purpose of which was to achieve more uniformity in entrance requirements. This report, so far as it dealt with French and German, established fairly uniform entrance requirements throughout the New England area. In some respects the report foreshadowed and anticipated the much more famous report of the Committee of Ten and that of the Committee of Twelve, both on high-school language teaching, to be discussed next.

In 1893 the National Education Association Committee of Ten made sweeping recommendations through its sub-committee in the field of secondary school French and German. As Bagster-Collins (p. 43) says, it wished "to determine the position of the modern languages in the course of study below the college level, and to a certain extent the college requirements for admission." Ideally it wanted modern language study begun in the elementary school and for this purpose it stipulated a course of four years there. Wherever this was impossible, the study of the language was recommended for the first year of high school. Still concerned with preserving the hegemony of Latin and Greek wherever they were firmly ensconced, the report advocated a two- or three-year course in the modern language for the classical (then often called "Latin-scientific") high-school course, four years of one modern language and three of another for the "modern language course," and four years of any foreign language (Latin included) for the "English course."

If extensive reading is an ideal which long prevailed, the report of the Committee of Ten was one of the first widespread manifestoes to advocate it formally. It places strong emphasis on reading and includes a recommendation in favor of sight reading, to be begun at the earliest opportunity. The stress was upon reading and more reading, even at the expense of thoroughness, if need be. The more difficult passages were to be glossed over or explained rapidly by the instructor. As for grammar, it was never to be an end in itself and was to be taken up only after a good beginning had been made with several months of reading. The use of the language on an oral basis in conversation, and the cultivation of a good pronunciation, while described as important and highly desirable, are not dwelt upon at length, and a correlation between them and the reading objective is hardly attempted. Not much is said, either, about the type of reading to be done, but suggestions are made concerning the amount to be covered. For the elementary course in German, that is, during the first two years, two hundred duodecimo pages are suggested (for the corresponding French course, twice as much!), while for the third and fourth years a total of at least seven hundred pages is recommended (in French correspondingly more, i.e., about one thousand pages). It is stated, however, that nineteenth-century prose is to be read before the study of the classics is begun.

Unfortunately the report had certain marked weaknesses. It provided no bridge by which the elementary-school pupil could cross the gap to the secondary school in continuing the study of German. Besides, the report was brief and sketchy and too hastily written. Worst of all, in order not to interfere unduly with the courses in Latin and Greek, it provided for the notorious two-year modern foreign language course, which has been the bane of foreign-language teachers ever since. As the number of subjects and courses offered in the American high school increased by leaps and bounds in the next few generations, soon mounting to well over four hundred, and with the expansion of the high school into areas never dreamed of in the nineteenth century, less and less room remained in the curriculum for so "academic" a subject as modern languages. Hence the schedule makers, overlooking the fact that the two-year course was only an expedient suggested for exceptional cases, so as not to interfere unduly with the vested interests of Latin and Greek, treated the two-year course as the norm, which it was never meant to be. The final step, then, was to discredit the teachers of the languages because they could not accomplish in two years what requires at least four (in England, France, Germany, and almost any other country six or more). This has brought about the unhappy situation that the United States is still almost the only civilized country in which men think they can lay claim to education and culture without any knowledge, or with the merest smattering, of a second language. It has also given the United States a place far behind Russia in this field.

An equally important, perhaps even more important, report was that of the Committee of Twelve appointed by the Modern Language Association in 1896 at the suggestion of the National Education Association. It was more comprehensive than that of the Committee of Ten, more lengthy and more maturely thought out, and more helpfully detailed, at least as far as the first two years of

language study in high school are concerned. It did not appear until 1899.

The method of teaching advocated was the same as that proposed by the Committee of Ten: extensive reading (i.e., translation) of graded texts buttressed by the study of grammatical principles and accompanied by some small amount of oral drill. Much emphasis was placed upon the first two years of language study, followed by only a sketchy account of what should be done in the third and fourth years. Unfortunately this served only to fortify the erroneous notion outside the profession that two years of language study were to be regarded as the norm in the typical American secondary school. As for foreign-language study in the elementary school, the report stated that it should be optional and was worth while only if the child intended to continue it through the secondary school and if the teacher was really competent in the language.

This report, endorsed by the National Education Association, exercised a tremendous influence upon the teaching of the modern foreign languages in America. Its proposals were widely discussed and adopted, and even the less well prepared teachers did their best to modify their soul-deadening translation procedures in accordance with it. For it also proved to be, and was used as, a handbook of method. As Bagster-Collins says (p. 46): "When it appeared there was little material readily accessible in this country dealing with the teaching of modern languages. In brief compass, the report contains well put statements of values, although many may think them in need of revision; and brief but admirable analyses of various language methods then employed, the grammar, natural, psychological, phonetic and reading methods."

Most of the universities and colleges soon adopted the recommendations of the Committee, especially that of the establishment of three national grades of preparatory instruction, and in 1901, when the College Entrance Examination Board was set up, they were put into effect. But so far as the pernicious overemphasis of the two-year course and its gradual acceptance as the standard are concerned, this report was no better than its predecessor. Indeed, the effect of the two-year recommendation can be observed from the statistics. While in 1894 eighty high schools canvassed throughout the land showed that one-third of them offered two years of modern language, another one-third three years, and another four years (Handschin, p. 55), by 1900 the average time devoted to German or French was less than three years (Bagster-Collins, p. 31).

The founding of three professional journals, all important for the scholar in the field of German language and literature, also falls into this era. They are *Modern Language Notes*, established at the Johns Hopkins University in 1885 and still in existence, *Americana Germanica*, begun at the University of Pennsylvania in 1897 and now extinct, and *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* (at first *Journal of Germanic Philology*) started in the same year at Indiana University but soon after transferred to the University of Illinois, and still in existence.

We turn once more to the elmentary schools. The heyday of German in the public elementary schools of Toledo, Ohio, occurred between 1887 and 1891, when some schools were actually called German-English schools, with a supervising principal of the German Department. Of a total enrollment of 6373 pupils in 1882, 27 per cent were taking German. Proportionally the German enrollment declined in the last years of the nineteenth century, although as late as 1911 there were still 2029 pupils enrolled in German.[1]

We also find that in 1885 the New York City grade schools had over 9000 pupils studying German, while fewer than 2000 were learning French. As noted in Section III, at least a dozen larger cities from New York to San Francisco had German classes in their elementary grades, a practice which persisted as late as the nineties. And between 1886 and 1888 we hear complaints from the Dakotas, Minnesota, and Missouri that an articulate German population is instrumental in keeping German as the language of instruction in many schools (Handschin, p. 67).

The budgetary burden of an entire staff of additional teachers of German, however, proved to be quite irksome to many a school board. As early as 1879 St. Louis adopted the so-called German-English plan, which for better or for worse placed the German instruction in the hands of members of the regular staff. In this way $20,000 could be saved each year. But the plan was never put entirely into effect, and at a city election in 1887 a new policy was approved, providing "that no language but the English should be taught at public expense in the primary and district schools."[2] For identical reasons San Francisco began curtailing German instruction in its public grade schools in the eighties, so that by 1892 such instruction could be characterized by the superintendent in his report as one of the "educational hobbies" of bygone days (Bagster-Collins, p. 24). Boston did not get around to experimenting with German and French in its elementary schools until 1895 but dropped them after two years. Neither a competent staff nor a workable policy had been provided, it seems.

However, German instruction in the public high schools, private academies, and denominational schools increased by leaps and bounds during those years. By 1886-87 over sixty per cent of such schools, as reported by Handschin (p. 55), were offering either French or German, or both. During this period, too, German enjoyed a tremendous boom in many places. Between 1879 and 1895, for instance, the number of high schools and academies in New York State offering German rose from 162 to 537. During the same period the number of these schools introducing French increased only from 125 to 294 (Bagster-Collins, p. 29). And in 1898, Handschin reports (p. 79), German Catholic parochial schools numbered 130,000 pupils, while the corresponding Lutheran schools had 117,000.

Gradually, too, reading texts offering works of contemporary authors became more plentiful, giving teachers wider opportunity to select more modern materials. Many of these works were also edited better than those of earlier days. The editions of Wilhelm Bernhardt from about 1885 on furnish good examples. But prudishness still reigned in the classroom, and such contemporaneous works as the dramas and novels of the early Naturalists were unthinkable in the schoolroom, which no writer, old or recent, could enter unless he was as pure as the driven snow.[3] What is perhaps even worse, the usual reading fare gave no inkling of the Germany of that day, and offered mostly innocuous, romantic tales with little or no local color.

Turning briefly once more to the universities and colleges, and studying their foreign-language requirements for graduation, we find here too that considerable strides were made during this period. While in 1884 only a scattering of these institutions required any modern foreign language for an undergraduate degree (more German for the B.S. than for any other),[4] by 1896 over one-half of the thirty-five institutions canvassed required at least one such language (Bagster-Collins, pp. 41, 70).

In the previous section we noted that the Master's degree was offered in this country as early as the fifties. In 1879 Waterman T. Hewett received a Ph.D. from Cornell with a thesis on the

[1] Statistics kindly furnished by Dr. Richard Pheatt, Director of General Research, Toledo Board of Education.

[2] Annual Report of the President and Board of Directors of the St. Louis Public Schools, 1887, p. 10. See Bagster-Collins, p. 19.

[3] Even Walther von der Vogelweide had to "come clean," which explains why his most famous and delightful poem, "Under der linden," is omitted from Calvin Thomas' *Anthology*, published in 1906.

[4] See the two reports of 1884 to the Modern Language Association discussed at the beginning of the present section.

Frisian language and literature.[5] It seems that the first woman to earn an American Ph.D. in German was Anne B. Irish in 1882 at what was then the University (now College) of Wooster in Ohio, but neither the subject of her thesis nor the name of the professor in charge is known. We do learn, however, that Miss Irish taught at Wooster from 1880 to 1886. Columbia College granted its first Ph.D. in German to Hugo J. Walther in 1886. Under the direction of H. H. Boyesen, who held the Gebhard professorship, he submitted a thesis on "The Syntax of the Cases in Walther von der Vogelweide."[6] The Johns Hopkins University awarded the Ph.D. degree in 1887 to Marion Dexter Learned for his study of Pennsylvania German (written, it seems, under the direction of Professor Henry Wood), in 1889, to George A. Hench for his study of the Monsee fragments, and in 1892, to Starr W. Cutting for "Der Conjunktiv bei Hartmann von Aue." New York University granted the doctorate to William J. Eckoff in 1891 for a thesis on the educational views of Goethe.

The first University of Chicago Ph.D. in Germanics was awarded to Francis A. Wood in 1895. Under Professors H. Schmidt-Wartenberg and Carl D. Buck he wrote on "Verner's Law in Gothic and the Reduplicating Verbs in Germanic" (almost simultaneously with Brugmann's noted article).[7]

At the present time the larger universities grant, on the average, two or more doctorates each year in Germanics, not enough to satisfy the demand without recourse to Europe. The University of Michigan, for instance, granted 47 between 1937 and 1960, under the chairmanship of Professor H. W. Nordmeyer.

V. FROM RICHES TO RAGS: THE FIRST DECADES OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

In 1900 the languages, and particularly German, occupied a very favorable position in the high-school curriculum. We find that thirty-eight per cent of the accredited high schools in California taught two years of German in that year, furthermore that by 1908 the percentage had risen to a phenomenal ninety-eight, with many schools having lengthened their optional German course to three or even four years.[1] In 1913 Handschin could report in this connection that about 72% of *all* high schools in California were teaching German.

As compared with French, German had a tremendous lead in many other states, too. In New York, as we saw in Section IV, there were 537 high schools and academies offering German in 1895, as against 294 that offered French.[2] In the Middle West, of forty schools canvassed, twenty-three offered German in 1900 compared with four for French. Until 1915 modern language enrollment held its own, with German, to be sure, still far in the lead. In that year over 40% of the *public and private* high schools throughout the country were offering French (11%), German (28%) and Spanish (2%). It was in the North Central and West Central areas (e.g., Wisconsin and Kansas) that German was strongest. Undoubtedly the high schools, public and private, with their German offerings, constituted the backbone of German instruction in the United States during the first fifteen years of the new century. But the competition of the new commercial and social subjects, first introduced in the late nineteenth century and steadily growing, was making itself felt more and more.

The situation in the universities and colleges during this period was less favorable. Yet in 1910, of 340 such institutions, 101 required French or German or both anywhere from one to four years, for entrance. Two-thirds of the 340 required some French or German for graduation, and where no requirement prevailed, the choice of the languages was on an elective basis. Again, of the 340 institutions, all but three taught German, and of these 337 all but four offered more than a single year of it (Handschin, p. 50).

However, statistics like these give us a somewhat *too* rosy picture of the real situation. Even during the first half of the second decade of the twentieth century signs could be detected that the position of the modern foreign languages in the universities and colleges of the land was not as secure as might be thought. A study undertaken by Harry C. McKown in 1924 shows that as early as 1913, in 306 institutions considered, 62, or 11 per cent of the total degrees (552), required no foreign language for entrance, and that this percentage increased markedly in the course of the next few years.[3] And as for the foreign-language requirements for the B.A. degree in 35 representative universities and colleges in 1916, one required Greek and Latin plus one modern language; two, Latin and two other languages; two, Latin and one other language; four, two foreign languages; thirteen, one foreign language; and three, no foreign language at all. Taking into account the opportunity of using Greek as the second language in all these possible options, we find that in twenty-two of these institutions one could "get by" without any modern foreign language at all. And in practically all of them—29 to be specific –only one or two years of the language was required (Bagster-Collins, p. 70f.).

It is clear, then, that most of the instruction given on the university and college level in the languages, including German, was of an elementary nature even as early as 1916. In some universities, however, like Wisconsin and Columbia, it was booming on all levels. Many names of outstanding American Germanists during the first decades of the century come to mind: Francke, von Jagemann, and Bierwirth at Harvard; Gruener and Palmer at Yale; von Klenze at Brown; Thomas at Columbia; Faust at Cornell; Priest and Thayer at Princeton; Learned and Shumway at Pennsylvania; Henry Wood, Collitz, and Kurrelmeyer at Johns Hopkins; Hatfield and Curme at Northwestern; Hohlfeld, Voss, and Roedder at Wisconsin; Boucke at Michigan; Goebel and Lessing at Illinois; Cutting, F. A. Wood, and Schütze at Chicago; and the itinerant Prokosch, who left the imprint of his personality on a number of schools.

As for the teaching of German in the elementary schools, it continued unabated in Cincinnati and Milwaukee. Bagster-Collins describes the course given in the latter city in 1911 (p. 22):

> In Milwaukee it was practically identical [in 1911], except as to the textbooks used, with the outline of study published for the year 1892. There were two courses, one chiefly for children whose parents spoke German, the other for children of non-German-speaking parents. The general plan pursued was the same for both courses, the chief difference being in the amount of ground covered. Doubtless also greater use was made of English in those classes containing children from English-speaking homes. The center of instruction was the reader, comprising a "Fibel," and later four graded readers. The selections were taught by the question and answer method and afterward reproduced orally or in writing. Oral work and the vocabulary were also developed, in the earlier stages

[5] Ralph P. Rosenberg, "American Doctoral Studies in Germanic Culture," in *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, IV (1955), 30-44. Hewett taught at Cornell for many years.

[6] For Miss Irish and Walther, see Rosenberg in *Germanic Review*, XXIX, iii (Oct. 1954), 224-229, also in *American German Review*, XXI, iii, 34 and XXIII, v, 35.

[7] The information on Learned was kindly supplied by Prof. Harold Jantz of Johns Hopkins, that on the Univ. of Chicago by Prof. G. J. Metcalf of that institution. Prof. R.-M. S. Heffner reports that the first M.A. in German was granted at Wisconsin "in 1893-94," and the first Ph.D. earned by C. H. Handschin in 1902 with a German dissertation (under Prof. Ernst Voss) on the proverbs of Hans Sachs.

[1] Handschin, p. 56. Over one-third of the high schools of that state had a three-year course by 1908.

[2] In 1890, 10.5% of all *public* high-school pupils in the U.S. studied German (5.8% French); in 1900, 14.3% (7.8% French); in 1910, about 24% (10% French).

[3] *The Trend of College Entrance Requirements, 1913-1922*. Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 35, 1924. Quoted by Bagster-Collins, p. 40.

at least, by means of objects and pictures. Some of the selections were assigned for cursory reading. Special attention was given to exercises and dictation and memory work. Beginning with the third grade, supplementary material either read by the teacher or by the pupils was included in the work.

In smaller German communities too, like Westphalia, Missouri, the teaching of the language was still predominant about 1900, as W. A. Willibrand has shown in the *German Quarterly*, XXX (1957), 254 ff.

A survey of the Buffalo schools, on the other hand, undertaken in 1914-15, shows less favorable results. There the German instruction in the elementary schools was poorly administered and badly given. It consisted mainly of reading a given pensum, without regard to control or teaching of vocabulary. Drill in pronunciation and speaking was haphazard, and a syllabus non-existent. After six years of this type of hit-or-mass instruction, the children took a uniform examination covering as much as might be achieved in an ordinary one-year high-school course. In 1912-13 about seven per cent (740) of the 10,000 enrolled in German took this test, and fewer than 400 took an examination for advanced credit. As the report points out: "Measured by these results, nearly ten thousand pupils are taught by 67 teachers in 43 schools in order that approximately 400 may get what they would have been able to obtain under two or three teachers in one year of the high school course."[4]

It is no libel of modern foreign-language teachers to state that as a group they are conservative in their attitude toward innovations. Since this is so, it is not surprising that the average textbooks used during the first decade of the century still followed the patterns of the old grammar-translation method. One of the most popular, no doubt, was *Essentials of German* by B. J. Vos, first of the Johns Hopkins University, later of Indiana. It originally appeared in 1903 and during the next three decades went through numerous large revised editions. Perhaps the best touchstone for measuring the conservatism of this carefully executed and highly successful book is the fact that it postpones the treatment of the modal auxiliaries, indispensible for the mechanics of everyday speech, to one of the last lessons, normally not reached until the end of a full year.

This does not mean, however, that experiments and progress in the field of teaching the languages were not made. Although such experiments were begun as early as the sixties of the nineteenth century, through the introduction by Heness, a German, and Sauveur, a Belgian, of the so-called Natural Method at several points in New England, and then developed as an inchoate Direct Method by Gouin in the eighties, they did not reveal their full influence on a large scale until the advent of the twentieth century.[5] These methods require a native teacher with great energy, enthusiasm, and skill, almost exclusive use of the foreign language by teacher and pupil, much repetition, and an approach to the written word not by means of grammar but through oral-aural means. The method had many opponents from the start; they claimed that it is too time-consuming, that it encourages glibness, rather than depth, and treats adolescent and adult as though they were children.

In spite of the drawbacks of the system, it left its mark upon modern-language teaching in the United States once it had been developed into the Direct Method. Insofar as they stress the spoken word and the oral-aural approach and represent a reaction to the grammar-translation method of the Ollendorf-Otto type of instruction, the Natural and the Direct method are similar. But the latter is less radical. It exploits the methodology of its predecessors eclectically, does not throw grammar overboard yet never teaches it for its own sake, and follows a well constructed plan of presentation. One of the better text books exemplifying the Direct method is the beginners' book by Max Walter (of the *Musterschule* in Frankfurt, Germany) and Carl A. Krause.[6] But wherever the method was used in high schools, colleges, and universities (e.g., Cornell, Minnesota), it was colored by the personality of those who taught it with varying degrees of success. Bagster-Collins makes the following general remarks about it (p. 90): "Even if reading the foreign language is held to be the legitimate aim of teaching, the need was felt by progressive teachers for a more active control of the vocabulary and grammar than could ever be won through the mere learning of rules, paradigms and translation. The Direct method suggested that this could be accomplished by developing language material, usually a connected passage, by means of questions and answers. This procedure had long been utilized in the elementary schools, but now began to grow important in high school classes."

This, then, was the situation as regards the teaching of German in the spring of 1917. In spite of the lukewarm and in some cases cold attitude toward the language on the part of many school administrators, and the several weak spots and danger points that have been signalized above, German was flourishing in the public and private high schools in many parts of the country, faring not too badly in the institutions of higher learning, and holding its own in the elementary schools of cities where it was firmly entrenched. The war in Europe which had been raging for over two and one-half years had had some repercussions upon German instruction, to be sure, but not of an alarming nature.

But in the spring of that year, when the United States declared war upon Germany, hell broke loose. The propaganda, which had concentrated upon the German emperor, his army and submarines, with many allegations of atrocities, turned immediately, now that we were at war, against the language, its literature as a whole, and in some cases even against its teachers, who were confronted with the sweeping accusation of being "pro-German." Groups of vigilantes visited the libraries and removed German books; others came to the departmental offices in the universities and confiscated textbooks containing pictures of Emperor William II or equally "subversive" material. The readers of Paul Bacon, for instance, who perhaps had gone too far in "selling" Germany to us, were the objects of special vigilance and drastic condemnation.

State legislatures (twenty-two in number, according to *Language Development in Action*, University of Massachusetts, 1960) and a score of cities vied with one another in forbiding the teaching of German in the public elementary and high schools, or even in prohibiting the speaking of German when more than a given number of persons were present in the gathering. Other bodies politic campaigned against it. Laws were passed, over the protest of the Commissioner of Education, such as no tyrant ancient or medieval had ever dreamed of. All of these laws were later held to be unconstitutional. The attorney who argued the case before the United States Supreme Court said: "There can be no liberty in a state where its laws make it a crime for a citizen of the United States to teach or to be taught a foreign language." This argument prevailed before the High Court.

In some cases the pent-up hatred against German emigrants and the feeling that they had pushed too hard in Germanizing the schools in numerous cities as described above, also the fact that German had enjoyed too sheltered a place in the

[4] *Examination of the Public School System of the City of Buffalo*, Albany, 1916, pp. 105 ff. Quoted by Bagster-Collins, p. 21.

[5] Reference should also be made to Maximilian Delphinus Berlitz (1852-1921), a watchmaker from Breslau, Germany, the founder of the worldwide Berlitz Schools, which use a special type of "natural" method. These schools still thrive. In 1953 there were 25 in the United States, with 25,000 learners: 37% in Spanish, 26% in French, and 8% in German. They are said to gross $8,000,000 a year now.

[6] The method, as successfully used in Frankfurt in English classes and applied to this country for German, is described by Walter in *Englisch nach dem Frankfurter Lehrplan*, Marburg, 1900. On a visit to America he converted Krause to his method.

curriculum, may account for part of this mania. An effective propaganda against Germany which had been going on in the newspapers and magazines for three years can also be cited as a reason, as well as the fear that Americans of German background were in a conspiracy with the enemy. But the best explanation for such madness is undoubtedly the youthful buoyancy and cock-sureness of a nation which had not yet become mature. Few were sober enough to stop to think that German is no more the exclusive property of Germany than English is of the United States. In short, it was an ugly period in the history of an America which had become known for its tolerance.

As a result of this hysteria the study of German was either propagandized or actually legislated out of existence. All this came suddenly, like a revolution, and necessitated lightning-like adjustments on the part of school administrators. German, still enjoying riches in 1916-17, was speedily reduced to rags.

A few statistics must suffice to underscore the cataclysm. Between 1917 and 1919 the teaching of German became practically non-existent in the public and private high schools, 315,884 (28%) of whose students had still been studying it in 1915. By 1922, four years after the end of the war, the high schools had less than 14,000 students of German, or little more than one-half of one per cent of the high-school enrollment of 2,500,000. This compares with about 387,000 (15½%) in French and 250,000 (10%) in Spanish. In 1925 only five high schools in the state of Ohio were offering German.

It should be noted by teachers of all modern foreign languages that although French and Spanish, as well as other languages, profited to a degree by the decline of German, the standing of the languages as a whole suffered markedly thereby. To bring this out drastically, we shall anticipate by looking at registration figures over the next thirty years. During this period proportionate modern foreign language enrollment dropped steadily. By 1949, when the high-school population had risen (from 2,500,000 in 1922) to 5,400,000, French attracted only 4.7 per cent of the total enrollment and Spanish 8.2 per cent, with German trailing at 0.8 per cent. In 1915 German alone had about 28 per cent of the total high-school enrollment in its classes (the highest percentage ever achieved in the United States by a modern foreign language), but in 1949 all three languages together could muster only 14 per cent. To be sure, this is partly due to the growing popularity of the commercial and social studies, to the host of other more "modern" subjects, and to the hordes of new pupils with vastly different interests and equipment. For we must admit that in comparing the American high school of 1915 with that of 1949 we are comparing two quite different institutions.[7]

But these factors, important as they are, hardly contain the full explanation for so tremendous a loss *in so short a period*. I am convinced that, through the peremptory obliteration of German, all language study suffered. Not even the language needs of the second World War and the jet age, which have shrunk the earth to ever smaller proportions, not even the F(oreign) L(anguage) and the FLE(lementary) S(chool) Programs of the Modern Language Association of America, not even the far greater emphasis placed on languages by the competitive new and formidable world power which a menacing Russia represents, have up to now fully restored the study of languages to their rightful place in the curriculum, especially in the secondary schools. It is to be hoped that the language teachers will take this lesson to heart and never lose sight of the fact that they are first and foremost teachers of the modern foreign languages, and not of French, German, Italian, Russian, Spanish, or any other single language or group of them.

The profession of the modern language teachers, including the teachers of German, has gradually become one of the most overorganized. Aside from the associations mentioned in the previous section. there are modern language sections in most of the state teachers' associations, state modern language associations in New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, and a Middle States Association of Modern Language Teachers, another of the Central States, one of New England, and one of the Pacific Coast. In 1916 the organization now known as the National Federation of Modern Language Teachers Associations was founded, a "holding company," as Bagster-Collins calls it (p. 79) and as its name implies, which publishes the *Modern Language Journal* eight times a year.[8] It has always been constructively alive to the problems of the profession. And in 1926 the American Association of Teachers of German (AATG) was founded by a group of professors and teachers, chiefly in New York, among them Camillo von Klenze and Adolf Busse. It publishes the *German Quarterly*, and performs special functions through its Service Bureau and its Placement Bureau. The first of these AAT's had been founded by the teachers of Spanish about ten years before. There was some fear at first, especially in the Middle West, that the *German Quarterly* would interfere with the long-established *Monatshefte* mentioned in a previous section, which used to be the organ of the old *Lehrerbund*, and was published by the seminary in Milwaukee, but these fears have long since been allayed. Today there is not even a division between them (by articles on teaching *versus* articles on literature), as had at first been hoped. In 1926, too, when German studies were experiencing a modest recovery, at least at the beginners' level in universities and colleges, the *Germanic Review*, a journal devoted to researches dealing with the Germanic languages and literatures, was founded at Columbia University under the editorship of Professor Robert Herndon Fife.

Our account of the developments in the teaching of German during this period would be incomplete without some reference to new types of testing both aptitude and achievement. Prognosis tests came into vogue during this time and have proved useful, although it is doubtful whether their results have been adequately exploited.[9] Oral tests were also a new achievement of the era, used by a number of universities and colleges. But the problems inherent in administering such tests in many places under diverse conditions, and the difficulty of grading the results, militated against their full success. The many types of standard tests, too, involving vocabulary, grammar, and reading comprehension, such as the then new true-and-false and multiple-choice type, and the completion or fill-in type, have been tried with varying success and reaction, but have never met with universal approval. This period was also marked by the development of some excellent German Summer Schools, particularly that of Middlebury College in Vermont, first started in 1915 by Professors Marian Whitney and Lilian Stroebe of Vassar,[10] and revived in 1931 by Professor Ernst Feise in Bristol, now directed again in Middlebury by Professor Werner Neuse; and by the Junior Year in Europe plan, administrated until shortly before the Second World War by the University of Delaware. There are now numerous Junior Year Abroad or other similar plans in vogue (Wayne, Stanford, Heidelberg, Middlebury) with over 150 institutions participating.

If the collapse of German in 1917 was the most disastrous pedagogic event of the period, perhaps of all times, the Modern Foreign Language Study

[7] On this subject see James Bryant Conant, *The Revolutionary Transformation of the American High School*, Cambridge, 1959; also the same author's *The American High School Today*, New York, 1959.

[8] On the history of the National Federation, see William Riley Parker in *PMLA*, LXXI, No. 4, Part 2 (Sept. 1956), pp. 3-20.

[9] See *Prognosis Tests in the Modern Foreign Languages*, vol. XIV of the *Publications of the American and Canadian Committees on Modern Languages*, New York, 1929.

[10] Miss Stroebe will be remembered also for the highly succesaful elementary German course at Vassar, originally devised by Marian Whitney.

proposed by a group of twenty-four persons at a meeting in Atlantic City on December 31, 1923, was certainly one of the happiest and most fruitful. This study was carried on over a period of seven years under a Committee of Direction and Control, three Special Investigators, and a Committee on Investigation, as well as a regional one representing eight geographical areas in the United States. Over a period of four years the Carnegie Corporation, thanks to the sympathetic efforts of its president, Dr. F. P. Keppel, appropriated a total of $215,000 for the purposes of the inquiry. Professor Fife of Columbia University served as the chairman of the Committee on Direction and Control, and indeed of the entire Study, while Professor M. A. Buchanan of the University of Toronto was the chairman of the Canadian Committee.

The Study resulted in eighteen volumes on new-type tests, prognosis tests, achievement tests, on a laboratory study of the reading of modern foreign languages, on enrollments in secondary schools and colleges, on the teaching and history of the foreign languages in schools and colleges, the training of teachers, and on numerous specialized subjects such as the influence of foreign language study on abilities in English, and the use of cultural material and realia. Idiom lists in French, German, and Spanish, a German frequency word book, as well as French and Spanish word books were other products valuable particularly to textbook writers. An annotated bibliography of methodology[11] is also to be noted. Of particular interest is the *Summary of Reports*, compiled by Professor Fife, a volume of some 270 pages, the last in the series.

The "German Frequency Word Book," compiled by B. Q. Morgan as Volume IX of the *Publications*, well illustrates one phase of the contribution which the Study has made to teaching. The purpose of this book is to solve the problem: what are the commonest, most used words in the German language which should take precedence in teaching the beginner? To help determine this, the old *Häufigkeitswörterbuch* of F. W. Kaeding (1898) was used, which was originally compiled as a basis for systems of stenography. Morgan took the task over from V. A. C. Henmon of Wisconsin. Since Kaeding lists only spelling forms, not semantic units, Morgan had to calculate (or guess) total frequencies. But he also established a new principle in vocabulary counting, which he referred to as "basic" and "derivative," and which later gave the "thousand-word list" its utility. Thus, as part of the frequency of "binden," those of the derivatives like "Band," "Bund," etc. were also recorded. In this way the Kaeding list was turned into a useful pedagogical list by an AATG committee under Morgan's direction. The resulting list became the M(inimum) S(tandard) G(erman) V(ocabulary), first published in the *German Quarterly* and also in dictionary form by Walter Wadepuhl in collaboration with Morgan.[12] It contains 2151 basic words as a standard list for the student who has studied German for two years in college or four years in high school. One thousand of these words, marked by an asterisk, are for the first year of college or two years of high school. A similar list is by C. M. Purin.

Another valuable outgrowth of the Study is the monograph of M. V. O'Shea, *The Reading of Modern Foreign Languages* (Washington, 1927), on how much use former students of a modern foreign language make of the language. Much controversy was aroused by Algernon Coleman's *Teaching of Modern Foreign Languages in the United States* (1929), which decried poor teaching but accepted the two-year course, and held to the reading objective. Its chief critic was J. A. Mercier of Harvard. C. M. Purin's *The Training of Teachers in the Modern Foreign Languages* also appeared in 1929.

Undoubtedly the *Study* achieved some good results in pointing out glaring weaknesses in teacher preparation, lack of agreement on objectives and standards, poor testing, and indeed defects in the very organization of secondary instruction. It also performed a useful service in making possible more standardization in the preparation of textbooks, with regard to vocabularly and idioms, and thereby made testing and classification easier and more meaningful on all levels. It provided the means of systematizing and normalizing modern-language teaching. On the other hand, now that over thirty years have passed, the *Study* seems to have been too much of an academic research undertaking. It convinced only those who were already convinced. But it failed to convince educators that what language teaching needs above all is *more time*. In short, the *Study*, though complaining about it, was too willing to accept the situation as it existed in the twenties, as something inevitable. However helpful the sober reports of the *Study* are (or were in 1930), one would have welcomed somewhat more of a crusading spirit. A comparative study, for example, of the time devoted to the modern languages in the schools of France, Germany, and England, and their achievement, as against the meager and often futile two years grudgingly allotted here, might not have brought immediate results, yet would have been quite pertinent. To illustrate: instead of demonstrating the need for more time, and consequently demanding it, the *Study* simply abandoned the multiple approach (hearing, speaking, reading, and writing) in the two-year terminal course, in favor of reading alone.

Naturally the reports of the Committee of Ten and of the Committee of Twelve, discussed previously, are from our present-day point of view only of esoteric interest and value because they were animated by the classical ideals in education, now no longer held, and because they looked upon secondary education solely as a means of preparing pupils for college. Moreover, these reports were the result of experience, not experiment or research. They were brief, drawn up with dispatch, perhaps undue haste, and they did not differentiate to any marked degree between the nature of the work done in secondary school and college. But the Report of the Committee of Twelve in particular, although only one hundred pages in length, became, as Fife himself generously states in 1931 in his *Summary of Reports* (p. 2): ". . . a classic for the following generations of modern language teachers. In content and even in wording it was taken over into school syllabi and college announcements and the requirements of standardizing agencies like the College Entrance Examination Board, and it can still be read with interest and profit by the modern language teacher." On the other hand, one wonders how many teachers have been through the several thousand pages of the Modern Foreign Language Study (an investigation which required seven years), or even perused Professor Fife's excellent 270-page *Summary*. Already after a lapse of so few years, parts of the *Study* retain more historical than practical value.

VI. RECUPERATION

1

The recovery of German from the blow which caused it to disappear from those elementary schools in which it had still been taught until 1917, and which practically wiped it from the high school curriculum, making it chiefly a beginners' subject at college, and hardly a popular one at that, was slow and difficult. It seems now as though German may never regain the standing as the leading modern foreign language which it enjoyed during the early years of the twentieth century. The statistics in Section V on the high schools, the backbone of language study,[1] show what had happened. In the

[11] This bibliography, prepared by M. A. Buchanan and E. D. MacPhee, was continued in three additional volumes to 1942 by Algernon Coleman, A. Jacques, C. B. King, C. Balluff, and R. H. Fife.

[12] 90 pages; published by Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

[1] Today there are over a million and a half students of modern foreign languages in the American high schools,

face of a steady increase of total high-school population from 1,300,000 in 1915 to 5,400,000 in 1948, German enrollments dropped from 324,000 (24.4%) to 43,000 (.8%). During the same period, French enrollments went from 117,000 (8.8%) to 254,000 (4.7%) while Spanish rose from 36,000 (2.7%) to 443,000 (8.2%).

The impingement of politics on scholarship had alarmed all humanists, and particularly those interested in research in foreign languages and literatures. Many feared that scholarship in the United States would suffer, and that America would become increasingly parochial in its outlook upon the world. In his presidential address, delivered before the Modern Language Association in 1936, Carleton Brown deplored the plight of foreign-language studies in the United States and called for action.[2]

To be sure, in its early days the Association had defined its object as "the advancement of the study of the modern languages and their literatures." And until 1903 it had what was known as a "pedagogical section," in which questions pertaining to teaching were paramount. In 1915 the revised Constitution prescribed that such "advancement" was to be accomplished "through the promotion of friendly relations among scholars, through the publication of the results of investigation by members and through the presentation and discussion of papers at an annual meeting." Then in 1927 the Constitution went back to the phraseology of the original statement, but with one essential change: "study of" became "research in," and research was still the avowed purpose of the Association when President Brown spoke in 1936. This, however, did not prevent at least the majority of the membership from sharing his conviction that something had to be done to improve the condition of modern-language teaching.

In 1946 the Association unanimously approved a resolution to the effect that it had not abandoned its original purpose of advancing the *study* of languages. (This resolution was offered by Secretary Percy Waldron Long, with the sanction of the Executive Council, in order to clear the way for the known intentions of his successor, William Riley Parker, then serving as associate secretary.) Nevertheless the Constitution shows no corresponding change until 1951, when the purpose of the body was redefined: "to promote study, criticism and research in modern languages and their literatures." The most recent version (1961) adds: "and to further the common interests of teachers of these subjects." This latest edition of the Constitution also provides for "special investigations, or campaigns for public enlightenment" and authorizes the seeking of funds for these purposes, as well as declaring the Advisory Committee of the Foreign Language Program (FLP) a standing committee.

All these matters were thus constitutionally legalized after important activities to this end had already been going on for more than twenty years.

The most significant step which the Association took, in keeping with President Brown's warning, was to appoint a Commission on Trends in Education in 1939. This body held numerous occasional meetings over many years and made annual reports. Dean Henry Grattan Doyle of George Washington University and after him Dean Thomas C. Pollock of New York University ably headed this Commission for many years. It has published several valuable pamphlets, among them *Language Study in American Education* (1940) by C. C. Fries, W. M. Sale, and E. H. Zeydel, *The Study of Literature in American Education* (1941) by Howard Lowry, with the assistance of Horatio Smith and Oscar Campbell, and a Survey of the ASTP language classes (1944). These were widely distributed and deservedly admired but did not help increase interest in foreign language study in schools and colleges. Another pamphlet, *Foreign Languages Tomorrow*, written shortly after the end of World War II, which foresaw some of the coming developments, was never published. It was written by E. H. Zeydel, assisted by Horatio Smith, and aimed at something far closer to the present FLP than to the Coleman report in the Fife *Study* of the twenties.

A greater influence was enjoyed by *Personal Growth Leaflet* No. 117 of the National Education Association, *Foreign Languages in School and Life* (1940) by Zeydel, of which some 50,000 copies were sold, and a much greater impact was made by two articles in the *Modern Language Journal* by Francis Millet Rogers, then a Major in the Marines.[3] They showed quite conclusively that, as far as language needs for the war effort went, the reading-translation method had led teachers and students into a blind alley and turned out only deaf mutes so far as understanding and speaking a foreign tongue were concerned. In my entire twelve years as editor of two leading foreign-language teachers' journals, the *Modern Language Journal* and the *German Quarterly*, I did not receive so many enthusiastic reactions in the spirit of "let's make a new start and get things done" as these articles called forth.

By this time, of course, America was already in the thick of World War II, and even before Major Rogers had spoken, the United States Army—in December of 1942—had created the ASTP and its FALSC (Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum) and actually started it the following April, thus initiating the most dynamic period in the history of American foreign-language study. But it would be misleading to say that this was the achievement of the Armed Forces alone. Already in the fall of 1942 the American Council of Learned Societies, under its administrative secretary, Mortimer Graves, assisted by J Milton Cowan, and aided by Rockefeller funds, had started an Intensive Language Program in eighteen universities and colleges.

The Army began its area and language programs in the spring of 1943, with Cowan's help, and by late August nineteen curricula were in operation with the help of other government services, the American Council on Education, various accrediting agencies, and numerous colleges and universities. It posited a set maximum quota of 150,000 uniformed students at any given time. A relatively high percentage of those in the language program learned German. The objective was ability to express oneself adequately in the language and to understand it when spoken, this goal to be reached or approximated in six to nine months. The instruction was to be intensive in character, but the method itself (sometimes referred to as the "parrot method") was not necessarily an intensive one. There were few prescriptions, only suggestions, made to the teaching staff (to the great credit of those in charge, among them Charles S. Hyneman, Cowan, and W. F. Twaddell). There were fifteen contact hours of language study a week: a one-hour demonstration three days a week by a senior instructor (in pronunciation, grammar, syntax, and word formation), and two hour drill sessions six days a week, conducted by native speakers or "informants" (not necessarily trained teachers). The groups of students (not more than ten in a class, ideally) were small, lived together, and used the language as much as possible. In addition, language training, much of it in German, was also given to officers of various ranks in Civil Affairs Training Schools under Professor H. W. Stoke. Columbia University had a Navy Program.

The "Army Method," as it was often called, although it was actually the product of civilian language teachers, enjoyed remarkable success in many cases and was an excellent *ad hoc* achievement, although its accomplishments were over-

over a million in public and parochial elementary schools (FLES), and nearly a half million in colleges and universities.

[2] "The Attack on the Castle," *PMLA*, LI, Supplement (1936), pp. 1294-1306.

[3] "Languages and the War Effort," *MLJ*, XXVII, No. 5 (May 1943), 299 ff., and additional remarks in the same volume, No. 8, 571 ff.

publicized and exaggerated. Some of its best features, such as the allotment of more time and the emphasis upon speaking and understanding, at least during the early stages, as well as upon "Kulturkunde," were preserved after the war in discerning colleges and universities.[4] But the weaknesses of the method—its improvisatory nature, the inexperienced native informant, and the poor impression he often made upon mature students, the many drill hours for little credit, and finally the subordination of reading and writing—militated against it in the post-war era.[5]

But the transcending importance of the program and of the experience lay in the fact that it made the American public language-conscious and prepared for the coming developments. For that reason, more than because of any direct influence, the remarkable achievements of the fifties would have been almost impossible to accomplish without it, despite the dynamic drive of men like McGrath, Parker, Mildenberger, Walsh, B. Q. Morgan, and many others.

2

It is of course true that to some extent the groundwork for the tremendous language boom of the fifties had been laid decades before by such men as Doyle, Stephen Freeman, and Morgan through the National Federation, the AAT's, and the many other associations of language teachers. But they had won only the ears of the teachers themselves, and not those of the general public or of the school administrators, who felt estranged by what they considered the defensive, negative attitude of the language protagonists. By and large these apathetic or hostile groups were won over through the work of two men, who did all that two could do to reverse a trend, William Riley Parker and Earl J. McGrath. The latter had been appointed U. S. Commissioner of Education in 1949 and became a convert to the cause of language study. As early as 1950, in an important address at Florida State University, he uttered his message for the need for more modern foreign language study.

Four years before, Parker, one of the younger American Milton scholars, had been called from Ohio State University to New York, first to be associate secretary, then to succeed Percy Long as secretary of the Modern Language Association. Young blood was needed, not only to run the constantly growing office at Washington Square on the downtown campus of New York University, but also to carry forward and intensify the efforts to correct the bad situation to which Carleton Brown had alluded ten years before. Obviously the time was ripe for major action.

The choice of Parker was indeed a happy one. He was devoted to scholarship; he bristled with ideas, he was dynamic and had a faculty for getting things done; he was persuasive and gifted with a delightful sense of humor. Moreover, he deliberately turned his back upon the tactics of previous champions of language study. He did not attack or ridicule the opponents, but used a strictly positive approach. A tireless worker, equalled in this respect, perhaps, only by Morgan, the Stanford emeritus, he had quickly realized the seriousness of the situation in which the foreign languages found themselves. This despite the fact that they were hardly germane to his own professional interests.[6] In 1951 he began planning his campaign with circumspection. Then, on 27 April 1952, with the backing of his Executive Council, he formally approached the Rockefeller Foundation for a grant to make an ambitious modern Foreign Language Program (henceforth to be referred to as FLP) possible. After careful canvassing of certain key people, the Foundation responded nobly in June of that year with a grant of $120,000 for the period from 1952 to 1955, to which $115,000 was later added for 1955-58.[7] Thus the Association became most intimately involved in an activity which was purely extra-constitutional, as we have seen, so that at times it appeared as though the new tail were wagging the old dog. Indeed, one member observed that the MLA had become an FLA. However, knowing Parker, it is my conviction that even had his request for financial support from the Rockefeller Foundation failed, he would have proceeded with an FLP on a shoestring, if necessary.

On 3 May 1952, six days after Parker had made the formal request for the Rockefeller grant, McGrath, at the St. Louis meeting of the Central States Modern Language Teachers Association, again eloquently pleaded the cause of the modern foreign languages, especially in elementary schools. He had heard about the plans of Parker and, fortified by this knowledge, went so far as to call upon the Modern Language Association of America to assume leadership in promoting modern foreign language study. At that time this seemed to the uninitiated an unheard-of, fantastic notion, though it very soon became a fact. Then in January of 1953 he summoned a conference on the subject in Washington, and later, in 1955, as President and Chancellor of the University of Kansas City, he spoke on "Breaking the Language Barrier" at the Fifth National Conference of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO in Cincinnati, an address which was followed by an unusually lively and enthusiastic discussion. By this time, of course, the FLP was a flourishing concern.

Parker had become the first director of the FLP; a steering (later called advisory) committee, in which Morgan and after him Werner Neuse of Middlebury College and Jack Stein of Harvard represented German, had started to function at the beginning of 1953. Numerous meetings and conferences were held, and a large-scale campaign—but never intended as a crash program—came into being. A National Council of State Supervisors of FLs now exists, made possible by National Defense Education Act (Title III) support to the States, but a natural outgrowth of early FLP efforts at decentralization through regional committees, state newsletters, and other devices.

It should not be overlooked that those responsible for the FLP always thought of it as a program for all modern foreign language teachers and their students, and never as a means to promote the Modern Language Association. Among those who have played a major part in the program, besides the men already mentioned, are Theodore Andersson, who succeeded Parker as director; Kenneth Mildenberger, who followed Andersson in that post; and Donald D. Walsh, who succeeded Mildenberger. Also J. Wesley Childers, John H. Fisher, Allan F. Hubbell, C. Grant Loomis, Archibald T. MacAllister, Wilmarth Starr, and Robert E. Taylor. For a while Walsh, of the Choate School, was associate director; at present he is director of the important FLP Research Center at 70 Fifth Avenue, not far from the MLA office. After resigning as MLA secretary in 1956, to be Distinguished Service Professor of English at Indiana University, Parker served for more than six months (from December 1958 on) also as chief of the Language Development Section of the U. S. Office of Education, to implement the provisions of the then new

[4] Among progressive language programs already in existence *before* ATSP, the Cornell Univ. program is to be mentioned. See W. G. Moulton in *PMLA*, LXVII, iv, Part 2 (1952), 38-46.

[5] See especially Genetic Psychology Monographs, XXXVIII, 1st half, Aug. 1948: *Modern Language Learning: The Intensive Course as sponsored by the U.S. Army, and Implications for the Undergraduate Course of Study*. By Melva Lind, pp. 3-81. See also articles by Charles S. Hyneman in *American Political Science Review*, XXXVIII (1944), 342-353, and in *Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors*, XXXI (1945), 434-447.

[6] From the start Parker quietly exploited his obvious lack of any vested interest and his obvious role as leader of a learned society. These facts gave him an incalculable advantage in his dealings with professional educators, graduate school deans, the Board of Directors of the American Council of Learned Societies (of which he was a member), and the Executive Committee of the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO (of which he was also a member).

[7] By 1957 the FLP was going full swing, and the Association pledged to continue it indefinitely. In 1956 George Winchester Stone, Jr., became secretary, and he succeeded in securing additional funds from the Carnegie Corporation and the Ford Foundation for staff members.

National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Mildenberger succeeded him in this post in the summer of 1959.

The FLP was indeed a many-faceted undertaking. From 1953 on a series of mimeo Bulletins, about sixty all told, spread over a period of almost five years, and also four printed Reports were sent broadcast to a long list of key persons. They contained news of recent developments, statistics on enrollments, practical helps and suggestions, and useful bibliography. The Publications of the Association (*PMLA*) each year contained, and still contain, significant reports on the progress of the Program, as well as articles of more than passing interest and value.[8]

Another noteworthy accomplishment was Parker's book *The National Interest and Foreign Languages; a discussion guide and work paper prepared for citizen consultations, sponsored by the U. S. National Commission for UNESCO* (1954). Although the "citizen consultations" were slow in starting, the epoch-making book soon went into a greatly revised second edition (1957) and has been a valuable statistical source and a powerful influence for the cause of language study. A third edition is now available (1961).

Most useful too have been the statistics on enrollments at all levels of instruction; lists of high-school teachers of the various modern foreign languages and their addresses; requirements for entrance and for graduation in colleges and universities; material relating to language laboratories, radio and television courses in the languages, and information on almost every other conceivable subject pertaining to foreign-language teaching. Helpful hints on realia and their use and methods of presentation have been sponsored under the auspices of the FLP. Among the other important achievements have been the part played by the Program in encouraging and helping to develop the use of audio-lingual-visual aids, the fillip which has been given the language teachers' associations, and the lively, encouraging FLP notes in each issue of *PMLA*. A place near the top of the list is also due the highly successful introduction of foreign language teaching in the elementary schools (FLES).

A frank assessment of shortcomings and achievements of FLP through 1958 is that of Mildenberger in *PMLA*, LXXIV, ii (1959). He calls among other things for more young scholars with an interest in professional problems, a collaborative role for the language associations, and the development of the state organizations, better evaluation of teaching materials, and more helpful counsel and guidance for teachers. On the other hand, he notes a new *esprit de corps* among teachers of modern FLs, praises the state newsletters and the liaison achieved with responsible elements in all walks of life, and emphasizes that the FLP has always been conducted in the best spirit of the humanities.

But the most important result of the FLP, no doubt, has been the NDEA of 1958 (Titles III, IV, and VI),[9] insofar as it authorized many millions of dollars for aid in the training of modern FL and other teachers, and in procuring equipment for this purpose, as well as for helping to alleviate the shortage, and to improve the quality, of language teachers on all levels by means of most attractive inducements. Rockefeller Foundation support for the FLP had ended August 31; the NDEA began two days later!

The various forms which this NDEA help, specifically for the languages, will continue to take for the immediate future (institutes, language and area centers, fellowships, contracts for research, loans to non-profit private schools, grants-in-aid to agencies, organizations and individuals for research) are well known by now.[10] During 1958-60 more than $43 million was spent on the improvement of FL teaching, about $13 million of this consisting of matching funds from States and institutions of higher education. In this way the federal government once for all convinced many who still doubted it that foreign-language study is a critical need of the age.

A weaker link in the FLP chain, even after almost nine years of strenuous activity, is still the situation in the high schools. But here, too, definite improvement can be noted, especially in German, thanks no doubt to the FLP.

Two books by James Bryant Conant, former president of Harvard and High Commissioner in West Germany,[11] and the many addresses which he has made in various parts of the country may be expected to support the claims of German.

In August 1959, a year after the Rockefeller aid totalling almost a quarter of a million dollars had come to an end and the Program was running well, its further progress was entrusted to the FLP Research Center, as we have seen. Two projects occupy most of its attention, testing under Wilmarth Starr, and research under J. W. Childers.

Parker would disclaim credit for the timing, but it remains true that no program has ever been better timed than the FLP. Thanks to it, a new buoyancy and a bright spirit of fresh hopefulness now characterize the profession of modern-language teaching. The old theory that America is a "melting pot" and should discourage the teaching of FLs is just as dead as is the method of teaching for which "la plume de ma tante" stands as a symbol.

3

I am aware that most of what has been said so far in this section sounds as though it belonged in a history of the teaching of modern foreign-languages rather than in one dealing with German alone. But in my opinion this is not only inevitable but also indicative of the fact that the modern foreign-languages, as a subject in the school and college curriculum, have laid aside their old jealousies and rivalries.

We are now ready to consider how these developments, the happiest in the entire history of language teaching in America, affected the educational picture and specifically German. We shall begin with the colleges and universities and progress through the secondary to the elementary schools.

[8] Parker's report on the first years of the FLP, LXIX, i (March 1954), 12-21; his truly standard "Why a Foreign Language Requirement?" LXXII, ii (April 1957), 1-12; Mildenberger's report through 1957, LXXIII, ii (April 1958), vi-vii, and again in May 1959; and the report of the National Association of Secondary School Principals on "Modern Foreign Languages in the Comprehensive Secondary School," as well as the article by W. J. Wolfe on "Foreign Language Entrance and Degree Requirements for the B.S. Degree," LXXIV, iv, Part 2 (Sept. 1959); and the report by Walsh on 1959, LXXV, ii (May 1960), 20-24, followed in 1961 by a similar report on 1960.

[9] That the FLP and Parker's booklet *The National Interest* strongly influenced Congress to make the NDEA the law of the land is clear to all who are familiar with the part played by Parker and Mildenberger. In March 1957 *The National Interest* served as the chief discussion paper at the U. S. Office of Education conference on language needs in government agencies. This conference, attended by 56 officials representing 20 agencies, led within two weeks to the initial formulation of Title VI, NDEA (long before Sputnik), and Parker's book provided most of the argument that was subsequently presented to the Congress. As early as 1958, three months after President Eisenhower had signed the Act, Parker became chief of the Language Development Section (Title VI) of the U. S. Office of Education (charged with carrying out the provisions of the Act), as we have seen. From November of that year he commuted weekly from Bloomington, Indiana, to Washington until relieved in July 1959, by Mildenberger, who was already in the Office of Education as consultant. As early as July 1956 Dr. Marjorie C. Johnston, prominent in FLP circles, had become the first specialist for FL in the U. S. Office of Education. From 1958 on she played a crucial part in implementing the FL parts of Title III, NDEA, and in coordinating Title III and Title VI activities.

[10] See John R. Ludington in *PMLA*, LXXV, ii (May 1960), 11-15. Twelve evaluators (Stephen Freeman, chairman) have appraised the language program of the 1960 Summer Institutes. See *MLJ*, XLV, iii (March 1961), 105-114.

[11] See footnote 7 in Section V. That improvement is noticeable can be seen from the statistics which will follow. At the moment it will suffice to say that from 0.8% (of the total high-school enrollment) in 1948 and 1954, public high-school enrollment in German rose to 1.2% in 1958 and to 1.5% in the fall of 1959, an 87.5% increase in a few years.

Certainly the situation in the colleges with regard to German was anything but favorable when the FLP was initiated. To illustrate: while shortly before 1930 twenty-eight New England colleges still reported that 64% of their students were studying a FL, by about 1950 this percentage had sunk to 26. And among the languages German was a poor third. During approximately the same period 43% of the colleges throughout the country offering the B.A. were forced to drop their FL entrance requirement, partly because the high-school enrollment in FLs (in the majority of cases an elective subject) had dropped by 52%, but, more important, because of the demand for other subjects, such as social studies, the lack of counseling in favor of the languages, and the dissatisfaction of World War I veterans with the way in which the modern languages were being taught. But by the time the FLP had been under way for a year, a trend to restore the language entrance requirement was felt in the colleges.[12] The same is true of the FL requirement for college graduation. These requirements are being strengthened from year to year and in many institutions, so that by 1959-60, of 899 accredited colleges and universities with a B.A. program, 284 required a FL for entrance (31.6%) and 772 (85.9%) had a FL requirement for graduation, and an additional twelve with no formal degree requirement were among those with the entrance requirement, making a total of 784 (87.2%) that considered FL study an essential element in liberal education.

As for German, while in 1954 only 315 students graduated with a major in German out of 3548 B.A.'s in FL, in 1957 German had a gain in this respect of 10.3% in 583 colleges over 1954. During the same time total college enrollments went up only 8.8%.

Some data from widely scattered institutions will serve to illustrate a fairly general trend. In 1956 the Detroit Institute of Technology introduced modern FL in its curriculum for the first time. The University of New Hampshire, which never had such an entrance requirement, recently introduced a two-year requirement. In 1956 the University of Idaho increased its FL degree requirement from eight hours to four semesters. Cornell University, which had dropped its FL entrance requirement in 1941, will by 1961 require three years of one language and recommend four years of one and at least two of another. Vassar now requires four years of one FL, or three of one and two of a second for entrance, while Mt. Holyoke has a similar requirement. By 1962 Columbia College will require three years of a FL for entrance. Numerous other institutions have recently raised or restored their FL requirements, among them Middlebury, Williams, Ohio Northern, Hood, Redlands, Rice, Southern Methodist, Texas Christian, and Yale. Since 1952, 42 colleges or universities have restored or introduced the degree requirement, and at least 26 have restored the entrance requirement.

An intresting trend, too, is the statement of the FL requirements in terms of actual proficiency in reading and even speaking and understanding. Some two dozen institutions now follow this practice, among them Elmira College, the University of San Francisco, and the University of Michigan.

In total college enrollments German was still behind French and Spanish in 1959, but gaining, according to the final[13] annual survey of Appleton-Century-Crofts, published in February 1960. In 657 institutions reporting, the French enrollment was 158,271 (a gain of 9.4% over the year before), that of Spanish 121,845 (a gain of 8.1%), and, that of German 109,712 (a gain of 13.6%). The MLA 1959 survey shows university and college enrollments in German at 121,855. In a number of colleges and universities, among them Berea, Bradley, Buffalo, California at Riverside, Cincinnati, Hamline, Haverford, Johns Hopkins, Lehigh, Louisville, Minnesota, Mississippi, North Dakota, Pennsylvania State, Pittsburgh, Rice, Rochester, University of Washington, Wooster, and Wisconsin at Milwaukee, the enrollments in German were substantially higher than in either French or Spanish. In the fall of 1956 the University of Illinois led with 1655 enrollments in German, in 1959 it was still in the lead with 2031.

As for the number of undergraduates majoring in German in some thirty universities, the annual reports of C. R. Goedsche of Northwestern University show that this number has increased steadily from 218 in 1953 to 670 in 1960, and the number of graduate students has risen steadily from 321 in 1954 to 588 in 1960.[14] In one state university it is reported that 70% of all science majors study German, but that the percentage of German majors in language, literature, and the arts in general is painfully small. As for the FL reading requirement for the doctorate, all thirty-seven members of the Association of Graduate Schools require two FLs (German usually selected as one of them), with some substitutions (e.g., courses in statistics). Harvard Dean Elder's questionnaire of 1956 showed that a majority of Harvard Ph.D.'s favored at least maintaining the present standard.

As regards NDEA Summer Institutes for teachers in 1960, eight universities offered German for secondary-school teachers, and in addition Stanford gave an advanced institute near Stuttgart for 78 teachers of German. The Universities of Kansas and New Hampshire offered German for elementary-school teachers. As for NDEA graduate fellowships in modern FLs in the academic year 1960-61, 474 students held them at 34 colleges and universities, a goodly share of them in German or related fields.

If there are points that seem encouraging in what has been said about FLs, and particularly German, at the college level, the situation in the high schools, which was still bad in 1954, shows some improvement in recent years. Let us examine some of the numerous available statistics. In the New York City high schools there were 18,922 pupils taking German in 1935. This dropped to 10,241 in 1940, to 8,085 in 1945, to 6,770 in 1950, and to 4,605 in 1955, with a slight rise to 4,926 in 1960. Undoubtedly Hitler and World War II had much to do with this. In Toledo, Ohio, only 248 pupils in four of the seven high schools are now taking German. In Cincinnati, German, four years of which are offered (but IV always together with III, and sometimes even with II and III), has been the step-child among the three modern languages in enrollments ever since 1917. Its total enrollment in 1960 was 415 (174 in I, 164 in II, with the rest in II-III-IV and III-IV combinations), as against 2001 in French and 2236 in Spanish. Spanish, French, and Latin have been running a close race for the past few years, but Latin is losing, except in the classical Walnut Hills High School, which offers a rich Latin program. I have examined statistics as far back as 1947 and find that German has been below three hundred only once, in 1949 (294). In 1957 it passed four hundred (442) for the first time, and 463 in September of that year has been its highest peak. Second-year enrollment has remained at about 80% or more of that in the first year, but less than half of the second-year students go on into the third year. As for proportionate increase, German has barely matched that of total enrollment in grades 9-12: 60% since 1947. Latin, French, and Spanish may now be studied in the seventh grade in the Cincinnati junior high schools,

[12] It is noticeable from 1953 on. See *PMLA*, LXVIII, iv, Part 2 (Sept. 1953), 40-55; LXIX, iv, Part 2 (Sept. 1954), 34-50; LXXII, iv, Part 2 (Sept. 1957), 33-51; LXXV, iv, Part 2 (Sept. 1960), 14-28.

[13] The survey has now been taken over by the MLA. See "MFL Enrollments in Colleges and Universities, Fall 1958-Fall 1959" by Mara Vamos, Harry Margulis, and Frank White, MLA, FLP Research Center. Dated January 23, 1961, with some variation in figures.

[14] The U. S. Office of Education reported for 1958-59: 516 bachelors in German (a 2.7% gain over 1957-58), 118 masters (a 16.9% gain), and 36 doctors. But few of these go into teaching.

but not German. Allowing for those taking two or more languages, slightly less than 40% of the total senior high school population of Cincinnati are learning Latin or a modern FL.[15]

According to the enrollment statistics of the Ohio State Department of Education, Latin, with about 15% of the total enrollment, is still by far the most popular language in the senior and junior high schools of the state, with Spanish, French, and German following in that order and with a total of about 11%. But as a group the languages have proportionately less enrollment today than they had in 1945, the only language that has gained a little being French. German lost steadily for a decade since 1945, dropping from 1.40% in that year to 0.88% in 1955-56 but again gaining slightly since then. In 1953-54, 54% of the public high schools offered no FL at all, and German was being taught in only 56 such schools throughout the state. At the moment German is very slightly stronger in the parochial and private than in the public schools of Ohio.

Turning to a typical American city that does not have a strong German, yet a considerable Northern European element, we find that in the senior high schools of Minneapolis the first semester enrollment in German dropped from 475 in 1935 to 171 in 1950, but has increased almost 400% since then. In the junior high schools the increase has been from 12 pupils in 1935 to 97 in 1960.[16]

Of the total of 391,000 pupils in grades 9-12 of the California high schools in 1951-52, only 28% were studying Fls: Spanish 78,000, Latin 19,000, French 12,000, and German 2,200 (over one-half of these in the first-year course). In 1953-54 Illinois had but 64 teachers of German in the high schools (39 of these full time), North Dakota, 33 teachers of all FLs (14 of them in colleges and universities), and even Wisconsin reported only 1,200 pupils in German classes as against more than three times that many in French and Spanish.

In 1955 Wyoming, Mississippi, Vermont, Alabama, New Mexico, Tennessee, North and South Carolina, and Florida offered no high school German at all (Raleigh, N.C., reintroduced it in 1956). In 38 states and the District of Columbia only 0.8% of the pupils were learning German, compared with 5.6% in French and 7.3% in Spanish. In 1954 there were 78 public high-school pupils (in two schools) in Delaware, and 105 more in five private schools studying German. On the whole, FL enrollment is a trifle better in the private schools throughout the land, as we found it in Ohio.

Although the secondary-school situation was still bad in 1955,[17] general improvement can be noted since then. Indeed, modest gains are to be found, even by 1955, in Virginia, New Jersey, New York, Rhode Island, New Hampshire, and California. An encouraging fact, too, is that in July 1957, the State Board of Education of Georgia ruled that beginning in 1958 every public high school in that state must offer at least two units of a FL to be certified. By 1959-60, 96.1% of the Pennsylvania high schools were offering FLs, 240 German, 480 Spanish, 594 French, and 846 Latin.[18] In 1960, with about three-fourths of the returns available, there were 1253 high-school teachers of German in the United States who devoted at least 50% of their time to German, and 2604 with a smaller German load. But this total was only 23.8% of the number teaching Spanish and 23% of those teaching French.[19]

To provide more recent statistics, I turn to the third edition of Parker's *The National Interest* and find that by 1959 every state (except Hawaii) was offering some instruction in German, enrollments had doubled, and it could be said that German had about the same number of students in high school (123,312) as in college (121,855), with a high-school increase of 32.5% from 1958 to 1959. These figures might thoughtfully be compared with the estimated 550,000 Americans who visited West Germany in 1959. In Minnesota (3.2%), the Dakotas (1.6%) and Wisconsin (2.6%), German had more high-school enrollees than in French. It also showed strength in Washington (4.5%), New Jersey (4%), Utah (3.8%), and Illinois (3.2%). On the other hand, in 1959 Mississippi had only 26 students of German, Vermont 70, Maine 74, Alabama 83, New Hampshire 85, Tennessee 92, and Arkansas 97. Indeed, there were more young Americans studying in Germany during 1959-60 than were studying German in 16 of our States.[20]

A sad and most disturbing feature of the modern FL situation in the high schools is the critical shortage of qualified teachers, still traceable to World War I propaganda and to the resulting social taboo on German. In 1955 Kansas was short 87 qualified FL teachers. In 1956 the national supply of new FL teachers was short by 25.4%. In 32 states, 639 graduated that year, qualified to teach a modern FL, but only 397 (62%) went into teaching. In the same year the College of Education of the Ohio State University graduated 16 such majors but had 213 calls for FL teachers, 14 of them in German (with only two majors available). The University of Pennsylvania Placement Service reports a similar experience. The result is the same everywhere. When no competent teacher is to be found, the subject is either dropped or put in the hands of an incompetent, often with irreparable harm. It is to be hoped that the NDEA Summer Institutes will contribute to the correction of these conditions.

Perhaps we can conclude this picture with another ray of light that may at least brighten the day for wealthy parents of gifted boys. The Choate School in Connecticut offers a German program abroad in the summer, a month's study in the Kepler-Gymnasium in Freiburg, followed by a three weeks' tour through Germany, Austria, and German Switzerland.

Of wider interest is the American Field Service program, through which German-speaking high-school pupils from abroad are brought to the United States for a year, and *Classrooms Abroad* under Dr. Hirschbach, which takes American high-school pupils to Tübingen for the summer.

The teaching of foreign languages in elementary schools, or FLES, is of course no novelty in this country. We have seen how German thrived from 1840 to 1917 in certain centers with a strong German population. But FLES in 1950 was something radically different from its counterpart in 1850. Now it stems not from the desire of the parents to give their children Old World ties dear to the elders, but rather from two convictions: that regardless of ancestral heritage it is good for a child to be conversant with a foreign language, and that a child from about the third grade on can

[15] Statistics for New York City kindly furnished by Dr. Theodore Huebener, Director of Foreign Languages, Board of Education, for Toledo by Dr. Richard Pheatt, Director of General Research, Toledo Board of Education, and for Cincinnati by Margaret Rehring, Director of Foreign Languages, Cincinnati Board of Education.

[16] Statistics provided by M. Schoelkopf through the courtesy of Professor Emma Birkmaier.

[17] It was worse in German than in the other languages. As of October 1955, the others had gained 9% in enrollment over the previous year, but German lost ground.

[18] In sixteen other states in 1959, Latin continued, as it did in Ohio, to dominate the secondary-school field.

[19] See *Modern Foreign Languages in the High School*, Bulletin No. 16, 1958, under the auspices of the U. S. Office of Education, prepared by Marjorie C. Johnston as the outgrowth of a conference which she organized. It contains a wealth of useful information.

[20] Professor Emma Birkmaier has offered a comment on this section which has an important bearing upon statistics in general. She warns that recent enrollment statistics with regard to *large cities* are deceiving, especially when compared with statistics of a generation or longer ago because the middle class, which favors language study, has left or is leaving the cities for suburbs often not incorporated in the cities. Minneapolis has lost 50,000 in population because of this, but about 30 suburban centers have sprung up around the Twin Cities, so that in the last two decades, despite the urban loss in population, the metropolitan area has gained half a million. One suburb, Robbinsdale, had a single high-school class in German in 1950; now it has twelve.

acquire a second language much more easily and naturally than an adolescent or an adult. And if it is logical that a child from a family with a clearly German background be advised to learn that language, German FLES should be by far the most popular in many areas of the United States.

The development and dissemination of FLES as we understand it today did not immediately become one of the official objectives of the FLP. It was taken up cautiously because it was felt to be too controversial, and involved too many unknowns. In some respects, however, it has proved one of the more successful endeavors. Modest beginnings had been made by others long before 1952, for example in Cleveland since the early twenties. By 1939 there were nearly two thousand children learning a foreign language in ten localities. This number grew rapidly in the next decade, so that by 1949 about 150 communities in 30 states and the District of Columbia had such programs. In 1953 the U. S. Office of Education had ventured a start in that direction but did not carry through. By 1954, 300 localities in 43 states and the District of Columbia were involved, Spanish leading, French second, and German third, with 2200 children in 62 schools and 33 cities (17 states and the District of Columbia). This represented a tremendous growth (for German an increase in excess of 400%) over 1953, largely due to the work of the FLP, which sponsored a working committee for each language to prepare teaching materials, called a conference on the subject in December 1953, and prevailed upon the Office of Education to issue Mildenberger's *Status of FL Teaching in American Schools* (1953, 1954).[21] Between March 1954 and December 1956 the FLP sent a series of 19 *FL Newsletters* to every known FLES teacher. This was done at MLA expense. Similar growth can be recorded for the years following. In 1955 alone 79 new communities introduced FLES. In 1956 German FLES alone increased another 130%, from an enrollment of 2481 to 5676 (110 schools). By now the total number of children in FLES is well over a million in over 400 communities. Perhaps 25,000 of these are learning German.

Of course these are small numbers in proportion to the more than 28.6 millions of American children in the first six grades of elementary school. Yet considering that there are in all only some 1,500,000 modern FL pupils in the public high schools, the achievements of FLES in a period of less than ten years is quite remarkable. To illustrate the tremendous public interest in it, we need refer only to the experience of some organizers of classes. A modest announcement of a Saturday German class in Austin, Texas, for ten-year-olds brought out 125 children, where perhaps a dozen or two were expected; a similar call in Norman, Oklahoma, lured 162 the first Saturday and 187 the next. In 1955 the University of Minnesota advertised a need for daily demonstration classes in French, German, and Spanish (two hours a day). There were 4600 telephone calls, one-third of these for German. Only 60 children could be accepted.

The committees and individuals interested in FLES[22] have difficulty in finding enough qualified teachers, in preparing adequate syllabi and guides, and in convincing school administrators and college or university officials that FLES is not merely a fad. They are also aware that there must be continuity of instruction over a period of years. The administrators for their part want to know for which children and at what level FLES best fits in, which languages are best to teach, and how FLES can best be coordinated with other subjects. All these questions, they contend, not to mention the financial problems, require further study.

Nevertheless FLES, whether supported by a board of education, by PTA contributions, or by individual parents, seems to be here to stay. Several (but too few) NDEA institutes are training German FLES teachers each year, and there are now a number of German TV-FLES programs in various states. Recently the NEA in its pamphlet *Modern Foreign Languages and the Academically Talented Student* advocated ten years of FL from at least the third grade on for certain children, voicing opposition to the old grammar-translation method, and suggesting six years (or an absolute minimum of four) where ten years are not feasible.[23]

4

Throughout the Renaissance and indeed up to the middle of the nineteenth century, language teaching was almost synonymous with the teaching of Latin. Since Latin had ceased centuries before to be a vernacular tongue, or "Volkssprache," and was no longer developing (in which sense alone it can be called a "dead" language), its teaching naturally centered on grammar, reading, and translation. Then when the systematic teaching of the modern languages was taken up, this traditional method of instruction was applied to them, too, as the only known method. In previous sections we have recorded some attempts of forward looking teachers to correct this situation and to present the modern languages as very-much-alive, ever developing means of communication among millions of ordinary, commonplace folk to whom grammar is a little-known subject. But the FLP, taking its cue perhaps from the "Army method" and the experts in linguistics, is the first pervasive program to make it crystal-clear that teaching a language is not tantamount to teaching facts about it, that our need is not for grammarians, but for such men and women as Major Rogers, U.S.M.C., was calling for in 1943. Hearing or listening and understanding, speaking so that one can be understood, reading without translation, and finally writing with reasonable accuracy, this is the progression to be envisaged in good language teaching. Such is the goal of FLP today.

To help achieve it, the modern teacher has a wealth of electro-mechanical devices at his command and, with them, a treasure of information on how to use them. However, he also has aural-oral, or better audio-lingual, devices at his disposal which require no electro-mechanical equipment at all. Mechanical or not, these devices and techniques are not new, and the expression "new key" is a misnomer.

Speech laboratories were known as early as the twenties but chiefly served experimental purposes. Ohio State University had one in the early thirties, as did the University of Iowa later in that decade. But the "Army method" did not make much use of them, probably because there were too few language laboratories available at the time. Since the early fifties they have become widespread at both the college and high-school level. The University of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Georgetown, Ohio State, Indiana, Purdue, Michigan, Iowa, and Texas, among others, have large ones. There are nearly one hundred recorder and deck manufacturers scattered throughout the country, and numerous magazines, such as *Tape Recording* (Mooney-Rowan) and

[21] Much credit is also due Professor Emma Birkmaier, who in the Feb. 1955 issue of *Family Circle* (circulation, four million) published a rousing article on FLES.

[22] Professor Alice Schlimbach of Douglass College, Rutgers Univ., has been succeeded as chairman of the German FLES promotion committee by Professor Gerrit Memming of Albright College. Under Miss Schlimbach's leadership excellent "Practical Suggestions" were published. See also P. G. Kraus, "Suggested Methods and Materials for Teaching German in Elementary Schools," in *German Quarterly*, XXIX (1956), 239 ff. The following too are worth noting: *References on Foreign Languages in the Elementary School*, Circular No. 495 Revised, Dec. 1960, U. S. Office of Education; *Materials for Teaching German in the Elementary School*, Bulletin, 1955, AATG Service Bureau, Colgate Univ. (written by Emma Birkmaier); *Balance in the Curriculum*, Yearbook 1961: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum, NEA, pp. 105-112; and "Foreign Languages the Easy Way," *Saturday Evening Post*, Jan. 24, 1959, pp. 20-21, 62-64.

[23] See the twelve-step FLES rationale, *PMLA*, LXXV, iii (June 1960), p. ix. The *FL Bulletin* No. 17 of Dec. 1953 (22 pp.) is still useful. See also the *NEA Journal* of Feb. 1960, on a FLES symposium.

Audio-Visual Instruction (N.E.A.), are available. Useful books, too, have appeared in the field of audio-visual helps: *Sound Language Teaching* by Holton, King, Mathieu, and Pond, the *Purchase Guide* of the Council of Chief State School Officers, the *Materials List* compiled by D. W. Alden for the MLA under a contract with the U. S. Office of Education, Marty's *Methods and Equipment for the Language Laboratory* (Audio-Visual Publications), and Edward M. Stack's *The Language Laboratory and Modern Language Teaching* (Oxford University Press, 1960). The MLA College Language Manual Project, now the textbook *Modern Spanish* (Harcourt, Brace & World) should also be mentioned. It is to be hoped that a similar cooperative book in German will follow.

In 1958 over 240 colleges and universities in 42 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, had laboratories, and in 1961, thanks to NDEA, there were about 2,500 in high schools. With the support of Educational Facilities Laboratories of New York, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Purdue are conducting a cooperative project of research and experimentation on laboratory equipment.

As an indication of how important such facilities are today, Title III of NDEA strongly supports their use and Title VI practically makes them a prerequisite for all institute programs.

Teachers of German have been particularly active in the advocacy and use of language laboratories. Television courses in German are also numerous. In 1955 the TV Committee of the AATG published a pamphlet, *Outlines of Programs for the Teaching of German by TV* by Schwartz, Philipp, Eilenberg, and Neumann. Films of all kinds are available. There are also numerous radio stations, some operated by universities and colleges, that broadcast German-language programs and offer instruction in the language.

In May of 1960 the MLA called a conference on laboratory equipment and materials at which Professor Emma Birkmaier represented the interests of German. Several noteworthy points emerged: electrical equipment has no place below the seventh grade; drill sessions with or without electrical devices are highly recommended; in purchasing equipment, the numerous helps and guides now available should be fully used and the best advice sought; above all, it should be understood that audio-lingual and visual aids have definite limitations; under no circumstances should they be considered panaceas or means of replacing the teacher.

The AATG has been mentioned frequently in this section, as well as in the previous one. Ever since its founding in 1926, it has been in the forefront of every movement aimed at improving the teaching of modern FLs. Even during the lean forties it made the best of a bad situation and appointed a Committee on the Two-Year College German Program (R. T. Ittner, Chairman, later replaced by G. J. Metcalf), which reported in the *German Quarterly* of November 1948 (XXI, iv, pp. 203-221). The Committee admitted that the "classroom experience" to be gained from such a course is "modest" (p. 221). Dr. Conant expressed his opinion of such a program more drastically in the spring of 1960, remarking that the student subjected to only two years of FL will be better off playing basketball.[34]

Since the FLP got under way in 1952, the AATG has cooperated wholeheartedly with those promoting the program. In general the teachers of German appreciated this, so that during the first years of the program the AATG membership increased by 14%. By 1957 the membership had jumped from 1351 to 2152, and the number of Chapters from 19 to 26. Now it has at least three thousand members and 32 Chapters. The Service Bureau had to expand, syllabi for German FLES, also the TV manual and revised cooperative tests were diligently prepared. Many articles on the new teaching methods and devices appeared in the *Quarterly*. In the fall of 1953 a committee on textbooks (Jack Stein, Chairman) sent out a questionnaire on the type of books desired. The answers showed that beginners' books with oral and written repetition and variation of model sentences were most popular, followed by "reading grammars." Only a minority still favored the fill-in type of exercise and English-to-German sentences. In readers, material descriptive of Germany today was first, then material approximating the students' own environment and experience, and last, material dealing with German-American relations. This is but one of the many important contributions for the good of the profession which Stein of Harvard has recently made.

The German textbooks now appearing reflect the new trends and show that at least some of the writers have assimilated the sound lessons garnered from a decade of research and a score of conferences, such as the FLP-sponsored Interdisciplinary Seminar held as early as 1953 at the University of Michigan. Beginners' books like *Deutsch für Amerikaner* by Goedsche and Spann (American Book Company), *Foundation Course in German* by Homberger and Ebelke (D. C. Heath), *Lebendiges Deutsch* by Meessen and Blohm (Ginn), *Deutsch: Erstes Buch* and its sequel *Zweites Buch* by Hugo Mueller (Bruce), all provideed with tapes (the Homberger-Ebelke book also witith records), and readers like *Im Wandel der Jahre* bby von Hofe (Holt) or *Deutsche Hörspiele* by Reeichert (Appleton-Century-Crofts) illustrate the ppoint.

Attention is also directed to the Auudio-Lingual Materials (tapes, discs, guides, and texxtbooks) developed by the Modern Language Maaterials Development Center in New York under ccontract with the U.S. Office of Education, to be ppublished by Harcourt, Brace, and World for gradees 7 through 12. Also to the MLA Guides for thee Third and Fourth Grades.

Middlebury at Mainz for graduatte students, the junior year arrangements, and tthe Stanford German Center (for undergraduates) hhave already been referred to and will show good rresults if expertly supervised. Among special schoools teaching German, the U. S. Army Language Schhool at Monterey, the USAFI (in which German is the most popular language), and the American IDependents' School in Germany also deserve mention. The many German area-study programs at various universities are noteworthy, as are the ssummer sessions for high-school and young college teachers sponsored by the Goethe-Institut in Munich, and the six-point program of the Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation in Philadelphia to improve the quality and facilities in the teaching of German.

Research goes on apace. Under a government contract the MLA has thirty-one test cconstruction committees at work to make tests of proficiency in seven areas: listening comprehension, speaking, reading, writing, language analysis, culture, and professional preparation. Similar tests for high-school pupils in the four language skills are being prepared. Professors Rehder of Texas and Springer of Pennsylvania are responsible for a *Guide for the German Major*. Numerous research projects supported by the NDEA are under way. Statistics continue to be issued regularly by the FLP Research Center under D. D. Walsh.

Perhaps America will never require proficiency in one FL for all students entering a university, as Russia now does, or eight years of one and six each of two others, as is required in Sweden. Nor is it likely that one-fourth of all adult Americans will ever be able to speak a FL, as is the case in West Germany. But we must be convinced, as Wilmarth Starr, then still at the University of Maine, put it in the September 1957 issue (LXXII, iv, Part 2, 10) of *PMLA*, that "we are in the midst of an open-ended process where what is yet to be accomplished is greater than what has been." For in the words of George Winchester Stone, Jr., executive secretary of the MLA:

[34] The new "Deutsche Sommerschule am Parifik" at Reed College (H. F. Peters, Director) seeks expresly to correct the weaknesses of the traditional two-year German course.

The outline for the future is clear and the need is great, namely to get fully into practice, and for a long-term operation, an escalator of language teaching from Grade III to the graduate school. The point is not to equip 43,000,000 pupils with a second or third language, but to offer wide opportunity for studying a second or third foreign language, under the instruction of inspiring teachers, with materials that increasingly challenge the interests and abilities of the maturing student. Natural selection always operating in Academe, will thin the student ranks appropriately, but within ten years after the establishment of the escalator, college professors may happily count on having large groups of students competent in a foreign tongue, able to read, converse, and discuss ideas and works of art, history, and society in a mature manner. And these are the persons the future needs in business, industry, and government, as well as in the teaching profession. The wider the thoughtful reading public, the more challenging to the humanistic scholar is his interpretation of the best thought and said in the literature of his choice.[25]

[25] *PMLA*, LXXIII, v, Part 2 (Dec. 1958), 85. The helpful 178-page mimeo work, *Language Development in Action*, already referred to in the Introduction and in Section V, may be consulted for further details. It contains six chapters.